UNITAS

Ecclesia "Clamat ad omnes ut revertantur et inserantur."—St. Augustine

INTERNATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW

Organ of the Unitas Association — English Language Edition

St. Paul Seminary
AUG 30 1952
Library

Vol. IV — APRIL-JUNE, 1952 — No. 2

CHARLES BOYER, S.J.
Ecumenism and Truth
On the Holy Father's Letter to Romanian Catholics
The Coming Assembly of Lund (Conclusion)

MARTIN JUGIE, A.A.
The Roman Primacy at the Council of Chalcedonia (Conclusion)

JOSEPH LEDIT, S.J.
The Church and the Dissidents

ALEXANDER MIRCEA
Kyrie Eleison

COMMENTS AND DOCUMENTS
"Veritatem Facientes" Apostolic Letter to the Romanians
Metropolitan Vissarion's Letter to Patriarch Alexis
A Statement of Lutheran Belief
Catholicizing Trend in the Dutch Reformed Church

NEWS
Ecumenism and Reunion—Around the World

BOOK REVIEWS

THE GRAYMOOR PRESS, PEEKSKILL, N. Y.

UNITAS

INTERNATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW
ORGAN OF THE UNITAS ASSOCIATION
ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDITION

Published by the *Unitas Association* of Rome. Edited by Charles Boyer, S. J., Prefect of Studies and Dean of the Theological Faculty, Gregorian Pontifical University, Rome.

With Ecclesiastical Approval

Inquiries concerning the work of the *Unitas Association*, and manuscripts should be addressed to the Editor:
Rev. Fr. Charles Boyer, S. J.,
UNITAS
Piazza Farnese 96, Rome, Italy.

Communications and inquiries concerning the English Language Edition should be addressed to the Secretary:
Rev. Fr. Salvator Butler, S. A.
UNITAS
Piazza Farnese 96, Rome, Italy.

SUBSCRIPTIONS

Subscriptions for the United States and Canada should be addressed to:

THE GRAYMOOR PRESS
Peekskill, N. Y., U. S. A.

Single Copy — 50 cents . . . Annual Subscription $2.00

Subscriptions for Great Britain and Ireland should be addressed to:

DUCKETT
The Catholic Book Centre
140, Strand,
London, W.C. 2, England

Single Copy—4 shillings . . . Annual Subscription—15 shillings

UNITAS

Ecclesia "Clamat ad omnes ut revertantur et inserantur."—St. Augustine

INTERNATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW

Organ of the Unitas Association — English Language Edition

Vol. IV — APRIL-JUNE, 1952 — No. 2

CHARLES BOYER, S.J.
Ecumenism and Truth
On the Holy Father's Letter to Romanian Catholics
The Coming Assembly of Lund (Conclusion)

MARTIN JUGIE, A.A.
The Roman Primacy at the Council of Chalcedonia (Conclusion)

JOSEPH LEDIT, S.J.
The Church and the Dissidents

ALEXANDER MIRCEA
Kyrie Eleison

COMMENTS AND DOCUMENTS
"Veritatem Facientes" Apostolic Letter to the Romanians
Metropolitan Vissarion's Letter to Patriarch Alexis
A Statement of Lutheran Belief
Catholicizing Trend in the Dutch Reformed Church

NEWS
Ecumenism and Reunion—Around the World

BOOK REVIEWS

THE GRAYMOOR PRESS, PEEKSKILL, N. Y.

Imprimatur:

✠ Aloysius Traglia

Archiepus Caesarien Vicegerens

May 22, 1951

Ecumenism and Truth

CATHOLICS are not alone in feeling some concern about the direction that the World Council of Churches might eventually take. Many Protestants are also giving their close attention to the matter, and it would seem that many Orientals are doing likewise for similar reasons. The unity of the Church has to do with truth. Acceptance of the same faith is essentially inherent in it. Nothing is to be gained in arriving at an understanding for the sake of meeting together, praying together, and collaborating in philanthropic or religious activities if it is not accompanied by a tendency to find an agreement on the same *Credo*. It is true that the World Council of Churches studies doctrinal questions; the coming Assembly at Lund at which the delegates will treat of the nature of the Church is ample proof. Yet we are pleased to find that its principal raison d'etre is being recalled from various sides. An awareness does exist of the danger that lies in going ahead to hastily, and of uniting in some way that would not necessitate an agreement on the same truths.

An article coming from the French Calvinists written by Pastor Emmanuel Chastand in the *Christianisme au XXe siècle* (Feb. 7, 1952) bears the title: *Oecuménisme et fidélité*. The author fears that the attraction of ecumenism could be harmful to loyalty. It is to be hoped that he is not exaggerating. If by loyalty he means maintaining one's position at any price, without distinguishing between what is essential and what is accessory, between attachment to the word of God and grievances that have already lasted long enough, between a justifiable protest and the perseverance in that protest even after its object has caused to exist, then ecumenism is out of the question. But, if it signifies taking precautions against rash enthusiasm, or apparent largeness of heart that would lead to diminishing truth revealed by God, with the pretext of conciliation and charity, then a Catholic can only be in accord with Pastor Chastand.

An article from another part was published in the Lutheran review *Fraternité évangelique* that follows the same lines as the Calvinist one. This article written by the Pastors Suss and Greiner declares: "God wishes to be known, confessed, and served *in Truth*. That is why our church is very demanding, even intransigent, whenever there is question of Christian unity."

Their intransigence is also ours. It corresponds with the warning given by the Holy Father Pius XII in his encyclical *Humani generis*, where in three different places he makes objection to imprudent and erroneous irenicism.

The hope of Catholics in carrying on conversations with their separated brethren is founded upon the force of truth. Without doubt, secondary and exterior factors do intervene and prolong divisions. One should also try to overcome these. However, the fate of union depends upon an intellectual refusal or consent. Therefore, Catholics hope that their separated brethren, in responding to the invitation of the same ecumenical movement to review their positions, will find new light in their meditations upon

Scripture and the history of the Church. They will come to understand that the spiritual goods to which they are attached are also to be found in the Church that their ancestors left, and that nothing has really weakened that Church's claim to being acknowledged as the true Church of Christ, and her right to receive love and obedience from all Christians.

CHARLES BOYER, S.J.

On the Holy Father's Letter to Romanian Catholics

THE letter that the Holy Father sent to the persecuted Romanians on the far side of the Iron Curtain draws our attention to that great portion of the Church Militant now suffering for justice's sake. How easy it is, when one is securely sheltered, to lose thought of those who are exposed to the fury of the tempest!

Gradually we have become complacent and accustomed to the outrages still being committed against all that the world holds noble and sacred in the person of Cardinal Mindtzenty. Alas! the Cardinal is by no means the only Hungarian now in chains bearing testimony; Archbishop Stepinac is not the only one in Yugoslavia whose ministry has been forcefully deprived him. Now the Pope informs us on the Romanian situation. All Catholic Bishops are either in prison or exiled from their sees, loyal priests have been deported or condemned to forced labour, religious communities dispersed, Catholic Oriental rite churches banned, Catholic schools closed, and the press handed over to the Church's calumniators.

In spite of all this, they hold firm. The Pope kisses the chains of these soldiers of Christ, just as staunch in their faith as the early martyrs, or those of Nobunanga in Japan. The same Spirit sustains the Church, and infuses strength into the hearts of the faithful that no force can vanquish.

The cause of union for which we are working here is without any doubt being promoted by the constancy of these persecuted faithful. Actions speak louder than words; deeds have their eloquence and their persuasion. The attitude taken by the Church in the face of the Bolshevist persecutors is precisely that which befits Christ's Spouse. Newman recognized the Church of the Fourth Century by the way it defended the dogma of the Trinity: *incessu patuit dea.* Today the Church proclaims its divine origin by the manner in which she defends the doctrine of love against the propaganda of hatred. Oriental rite Catholicism has been officially suppressed to the advantage of "Orthodoxy." But what do the better elements among our separated brethren think of this preference that atheistic communists have shown them? The news we receive leads us to believe that the effect has been a change of heart with regard to Rome; they now see Catholic priests in a more favorable light. They have learned how union with the Vicar of Christ and the Universal Church enables these priests to stand firm against their oppressors. In this wise the dissident Orientals have been given a salutary preparation for a return to unity when the day of liberation dawns upon them.

May the sufferings of our Romanian confessors of the faith convince all Catholics of this truth now amply made manifest: Marxist Communism is of its essence inimical to religion, and wherever it is in control, it employs means more potent than those of Nero and Diocletian for the destruction of the Catholic faith, and for the total eradication of the Christian name. Even if it did bring happiness to men on earth instead of terror and slavery—every disciple of Christ should esteem it as his enemy, mortal above all others. But we may be confident of the outcome: the Faith will prove itself the stronger. CHARLES BOYER, S.J.

The Coming Assembly of Lund

(Conclusion)

II. The Notion of the Church

At the time of its origin Protestantism radically changed the traditional notion of the Church. Instead of a perfect society, governed by the bishops, successors of the Apostles, under the supreme authority of the Pope, heir to the powers of St. Peter, it admitted only independent communities of which the pastors had no other priesthood except that of each of the faithful. This conception, quite opposed to Catholic doctrine, remains in substance the basis of Protestant thought. Even those Anglicans who admit the episcopacy, the priesthood, and the Mass, act at times as if they considered their ministers as simple functionaries whose powers are bestowed by the consent of the community.

One might say that the question of the Church is that which mostly separates the Catholics from the Protestants. Nothing is more logical because this question itself depends upon another which is the principle of Lutheranism, namely, that of justification by faith alone. If for the acquisition of the fruits of the Redemption it suffices to have confidence in the divine promises, the individual needs nothing more than a knowledge of these promises, and this requires only the reading of the Bible or the preaching of the Gospel. It does not involve special powers and a hierarchy to assure these powers. If one still admits a Church, it will be merely the assembly of the faithful, equal among themselves, and each one of whom is sufficient in himself.

Nevertheless, because of formed habits, the requirements of social life, and doubtless also the interpretation of Sacred Scripture, certain hierarchical elements have for the greater part been retained, and powers reserved to certain individuals have continued to exist. From this has sprung a real difference between communities. The ecumenical movement should naturally concern itself with this diversity so as to abolish it if possible, or at least in order to cope with its consequences. Nothing is more befitting a doctrinal commission such as the *Faith and Order Commission* of the World Council of Churches, than a study of the problem of the Church. As a matter of fact, this is the principal theme of the work envisaged for the Lund conference next August.

The preparatory study for this complex subject has been entrusted to a theological commission which has recently published its report.[1] Beforehand, Rev. Oliver S. Tomkins, secretary of *Faith and Order,* had published a sort of introduction to the work of the theological commission.[2] Indeed, the present report shows many points of similarity to this introduction. I should like to present here certain reflections which have been suggested by the reading of these two documents.

To what extent are the differences on the notion of the Church understood and appreciated? From the time of the Amsterdam Assembly it has been supposed that the deepest division is that which separates "Catholics" and "Protestants." It should be noted that these names

[1]) *The Church. A Report of a Theological Commission of the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches;* Rochester 1951.

[2]) *The Church in the Purpose of God. An Introduction to the Works of the Commission of Faith and Order of the World Council of Churches;* Chatham, 1950.

do not signify particular Churches, but rather tendencies. One is called "Catholic" who "insists above all on the visible continuity of the Church in the apostolic succession and the episcopacy;" one is called "Protestant" who insists upon "the doctrine of justification of faith alone."[3] This is practically the same division that has been expressed in geometrical terms: there is a horizontal direction which rests upon the Twelve established by the Lord (such are the "Catholics,") and a vertical direction which is orientated upon the Lord Himself (such are the "Protestants.") The two tendencies are usually found mixed one with another, but the fact remains that the purer the Protestantism, the less there is of the Church.

Yet in the concrete, one finds that all Christians agree upon certain characteristics of the Church: for all it is a permanent gift of God, it is the fruit of the Redemption, it is vivified by the Holy Ghost, and ordained for the salvation of the world. The points of the Amsterdam declaration that Roman Catholics may accept are reduced to these.[4] For instance, Catholics could not say that the Church is "composed of pardoned sinners," because the Church also comprises sinners who are not pardoned.

The pamphlet *The Church* presents the same points as Amsterdam (pp. 13-14) and rightfully notes in addition a certain community of language, of formulas of prayer, and of moral habits.

But, is must be acknowledged, this common basis is not very precise, and it is employed in widely different ways. A list of the principal sources of difference was drawn up at Amsterdam; it may be that the listing is not the most accurate possible. In any case, the Rev. Oliver Tomkins has little difficulty in showing that it hardly corresponds to the principal division of "Catholic" and "Protestant."[5] It seems to me that the listing in the report of the *Faith and Order* theological commission is truer and more useful. In resumé it is as follows: First, there is a difference on the notion of the Church. Roman Catholics and "Orthodox" believe that one only of the Christian communities is the true Church in the unity of faith, worship, and government. In the other denominations this notion loses its determination at varying degrees until one becomes satisfied in an understanding of the Church as all the community that recognizes Jesus as Lord and Saviour.

Another difference arises from the manner of conceiving the continuity of the Church. Anglicans and "Orthodox" require, as do Catholics, an uninterrupted succession of bishops from the Apostles. Roman Catholics add the continuity of the see of Peter. Others are satisfied with the continuity of preaching, and there are those who require no other continuity than conformity at the present day with what took place at the beginning, or simply the guidance of the Holy Ghost.

There is a third difference. It bears upon the mode of conceiving the unity of the Church. While the Roman Church, the Orientals, and a part of the Anglicans would have the hierarchy as the principle and the sign of unity, the Lutherans and Calvinists are content with unity of preaching, and administration of the sacraments. For other Protestants, unity requires neither hierarchy, ministers, nor written creeds, but the mere adherence to Jesus Christ, recognized as Saviour.

[3]) *The First Assembly of the Ecumenical Council of Churches. Official Report,* Neufchatel Paris, s.d., pp. 65-66.

[4]) *Ibid.*, pp. 67-69.

[5]) *Op. cit.*, pp. 37-40.

The preceding differences have their natural consequence in the attitude taken upon the sacraments. Roman Catholics and "Orthodox" accept seven sacraments. Anglicans retain the practice of the greater part of the seven without placing them on the same plane. Only baptism and the Eucharist are in usage among the Protestants, and some communities give baptism only to adults. As for the sacrament of Orders, the report of the theological commission shows signs of embarrassment (pp. 19-20.) On the one hand, it is clear that the Protestants have no desire to admit a true priesthood in their ministers, and a true sacrifice in their Eucharist. On the other hand, it is not at all an easy matter to discover exactly in what sense they exclude priesthood and sacrifice.

On the question of authority in the Church, contrasts are evident. Neither Anglicans nor other Protestants admit the infallibility of the Church. The Anglicans recognize the first four Councils; for the Protestants Scripture alone, as each one understands it, is the source of authority. It should be noted, nevertheless, that a movement is taking shape among them to evaluate tradition. Moreover, it is quite clear that if the dissidents should arrive at an understanding with the Roman Church on the question of authority, disunion would cease.

Confronted by so many and such grave elements of opposition, the task of the delegates at the Lund conference will by no means be an easy one. How is the cause of unity to be promoted? The need of doing so is felt more keenly than ever before: the success of missionary endeavors, the struggle against various nationalisms, and against Communism, and a strong desire for the preservation of peace counsel Christians to unite. But how are they to overthrow the barriers that separate them?

The report of the Faith and Order theological commission describes certain new theological trends as so many reasons for hope in the necessary miracle.

First of all there is now a larger field of activity open to laymen whether it be through the development of Catholic Action or like associations, or through the liturgical movement in the different confessions. It is to be hoped that theologians will take advantage of this fact for a better understanding of the Church.

Then, say the authors, there is a return to Biblical theology. Protestants are turning away from the liberalism toward which a too narrow interpretation of Scripture had drawn them. On the other hand Catholic exegetes have been encouraged by papal encyclicals to take into account literary and historical conditions of the Bible in the presentation of their studies. A greater accord on the interpretation of Holy Scripture could lead to a greater unity in the conception of the Church.

Contacts between different confessions brought about by the ecumenical movement have had a very strange result: the individual communities have come to know their own communions better, and have become more strongly attached to them. The authors of the report think that this state of affairs is conducive to greater unity because from it a better comprehension of dogma as such and a greater sense of the need for truth results. Love and truth are unitive forces.

The last influence cited by the authors as being conducive to the unification of Christians is contemporary philosophy. We feel less convinced

of its efficacy, especially in the case of existentialism. If one wishes to promote unity of minds, no advantage is to be gained in rendering concepts vaporescent, or in rejecting the light slowly conquered by scholasticism.

From reading the two books that we have summarized we learn that the sentiments of the authors are sincere. First of all, there is sadness in discovering how great and deep are the divisions which centuries have cleft between Christians. How small is the agreement on the very notion of the Church! It is accompanied by a sentiment of courage and hope. A greater union is desired; unity itself is willed, because Jesus Christ wills it, and because is is necessary in the present world situation. Unity is believed possible because to God nothing is impossible, and because men are showing a new will to union. Let a beginning be made with what is held in common: the authority of Scripture, the force of prayer, the love of truth, the will to obey Christ. Then God will show His truth, which is one, to souls who are well disposed. CHARLES BOYER, S.J.

The Roman Primacy at the Council of Chalcedonia

(Conclusion)

II. The Roman Primacy during the Council

THE affirmations and manifestations of the Roman primacy during the sessions of the Council of Chalcedon were many and particularly explicit. We shall limit ourselves to pointing out the principle ones.

First of all, the delegates sent by St. Leo presided at the Council in his name as had been ordained by him. They occupied the first places among the bishops, and were the first signatories.

From the opening of the first session, October 8, 451, they manifested their authority by demanding that Dioscorus be placed on the bench of the accused, *"because he had presumptuously dared to hold a council without the authority of the Apostolic See: a thing that has never been permitted, and that has never been done."*[1] Such, they said, was the order they had received from the bishop of the *city of Rome, which is the head of all the Churches.*[2] Then, when hostile cries were made in response to the address of Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus, the tumult was placated by the peremptory declaration that this former friend of Nestorius *had been reestablished in his see by the most holy Archbishop Leo.*[3] The orthodoxy of Flavian, Bishop of Constantinople, was also recognized by the sole fact that his profession of faith was in agreement with the celebrated letter that the Pope had written him.[4]

When this letter was solemnly read at the second session, the bishops acclaimed it enthusiastically as the expression of orthodoxy: They declared "This is the faith of the Fathers; this is the faith of the Apostles. We all believe thus; the orthodox believe so. Peter has spoken through Leo." "This is the teaching of the Apostles. This is the true faith."[5]

At the third session, the Roman legate Paschasius pronounced the condemnation of Dioscorus in the following terms, approved by all the council members:

"The most holy and blessed archbishop of the great and ancient Rome, Leo, through us and through this present holy council, in union with the blessed apostle Peter, who is the *cornerstone and the foundation of the Catholic Church and of the orthodox faith,* has despoiled him (Dioscorus) of his episcopal dignity and has as well deprived him of all sacerdotal ministery."[6]

The same legate Paschasius, at the fourth session, spoke of Pope Leo as the *archbishop of all the Churches,*[7] and his declaration was received with unanimous applause.

1) "Cum personam judicandi non habeat praesumpsit et synodum ausus est facere sine auctoritate Sedis Apostolicae, quod numquam licuit; numquam factum est." Mansi, *Amplissima collectio conciliorum,* VI, 582. Evidently, it has to do with an *ecumenical* council.
2) "Papae urbis Romae, quae est caput omnium Ecclesiarum." *Ibid.,* col. 579. Some manuscripts read: *Papae urbis Romae, qui est caput omnium Ecclesiarum.*
3) *Ibid.,* col. 590.
4) *Ibid.,* col. 679.
5) "Haec Petrum fides, haec apostolorum fides. Omnes ita credimus, orthodoxi ita credunt . . . *Petrus per Leonem ita locutus est.*" *Ibid.,* col. 971.
6) "Beatissimus et sanctissimus archiepiscopus magnae et senioris Romae Leo, per nos et per praesentem sanctum synodum, una cum . . . *Petro apostolo, qui est petra et credido catholicae Ecclesiae et rectae fidei fundamentum* nudavit eum tam episcopatus dignitate quam etiam et ab omni sacerdotali alienavit ministerio." *Ibid.,* col. 1043-1047.
7) Mansi, VII, 7.

In spite of these and other similar affirmations that could be gleaned from the acts of the council, the anti-Catholic polemicists of the Orient have the habit of calling upon the Council of Chalcedon for denials of the Bishop of Rome's divine right of primacy. They base their claims upon the 28th and last canon composed by the Council, which reads as follows:

"Following the judgment of the Holy Fathers in all things, and acknowledging the canon of the 150 Fathers, truly friends of God, which has just been read,[8] we also determine and decree the same things with regard to the prerogatives of the most holy Church of Constantinople, New Rome. For with full right, indeed, the Fathers accorded the privileges (*ta presbeia*) (which she enjoys,) to the city of Old Rome, *because that city was the dwelling place of the emperor* (or: *the capital of the empire.*) Inspired by the same consideration the Fathers, truly friends of God, gave *equivalent privileges* to the very holy see of New Rome, deeming with good reason that the city honored by the presence of the emperor and the senate, and enjoying (in the civil order) prerogatives equal to those of the old imperial Rome, should also ascend in dignity in ecclesiastical affairs, holding the second place after her. Consequently, the metropolitans, but only the metropolitans of Pontus, Asia and Thrace[9] and, in addition, the bishops who are in the barbarian regions attached to these dioceses, shall be ordained by the said most holy see of the most holy Church of Constantinople, that is to say, that each metropolitan of the said dioceses shall ordain the bishops of his province with the assistance of his suffragan bishops, as is precribed by the holy canons, while, as it has been said, the metropolitans of the indicated dioceses shall be ordained by the Archbishop of Constantinople, after he will have been notified of their election, which has been done regularly, and in conformity with established custom."[10]

This canon, laborious and confused in its wording, calls for several comments. First of all, it can hardly be considered as the authentic work of the Council of Chalcedon taken as a whole, since the authors, the clergy of Constantinople, presented it at the 15th session, at which neither the Roman legates nor the imperial commissaries, nor any great number of bishops assisted, since these last had already left for their dioceses. On the following day, at the 16th and last session, the legates protested energetically and demanded that their protestation be inserted in the acts. Moreover, the Pope St. Leo in spite of the urgent solicitation of the signatories, of the Emperor Marcian, of Anatolius, Bishop of Constantinople, expressly abrogated it.[11] The protestations had their effect, at least for the moment and the first collections of oriental canons omit this 28th canon.

But what is the real purpose of this decree? It is double. First, it has to do with ratifying the third canon of the Council of Constantinople, which accorded the primacy of honor (*ta presbeia tes times,*) or the precedence, to the bishop of Constantinople, after the Bishop of Rome. Next, it has to do with endowing the see of the New Rome with a superior and

[8]) Reference is made to the third canon of the first Council of Constantinople of 381. It began as an Oriental council and later became the second ecumenical council when the Roman Church accepted its dogmatic decisions, without, however, accepting its canons.

[9]) The word *diocese* is here understood as civil diocese; that is, a group of provinces. As is commonly known, ecclesiastical organization, especially in the Orient, is modeled upon civil organization.

[10]) Mansi, VII, 369.

[11]) In a letter to the Empress Pulcheria, Pope Leo writes concerning this canon: "In irritum mittimus et per auctoritatem beati Petri apostoli, generali prorsus definitione cassamus." P.L., t. LIV, col. 1000.

truly patriarchal jurisdiction in keeping with its new position in a purely honorific framework. How to legitimatize such an exaltation? Where is any foundation to be found for it? The composers of the canon could find no other than the title of New Rome, and new capital of the empire. To validate this new title, and to construe a precedent for it, they boldly proclaimed that the ancient Rome had received these privileges (*ta presbeia,*) because that city was the dwelling place of the emperor, and the capital of the empire.[12] *"It is with full right,"* they said, "that the Fathers gave to (or recognized in) *ancient Rome the privileges which she enjoys* (or: *the first place,*) *because that city was the dwelling place of the emperor."* Taken literally, this drafted canon, a novelty of pure invention and veritably an officious lie, constitutes a negation of the primacy of divine right that the bishop of Rome receives from St. Peter, and through St. Peter, from Jesus Christ Himself. It is hardly surprising that the oriental dissidents adopt this exegesis. But are they right in doing so? Without any doubt they are not, because the composers and the signers of the 28th canon have left us affirmations that could not be clearer of the divine right of the Bishop of Rome, and they corroborated these affirmations with gestures of true obedience and submission in his regard. One should first read the obsequiously deferential letter that they sent to the Pope before their leave-taking in which they beseech him to approve their decree on the exaltation of the see of the New Rome. They address St. Leo as the *interpreter of the voice of Peter; he who has received from the Saviour the custody of the vine,* that is to say, the entire Church; *the head of which they are the members, the father of which they are the sons.* They supplicate him to honor their decree with his assent, just as they have concorded with the head to proclaim the true faith. They assure him that they have informed him of all that had occurred in testimony of the purity of their intentions, and *so as to obtain his approbation and confirmation.*[13]

One should then consider what Anatolius of Constantinople, the principle protagonist interested in the affair, has to say. He likewise wrote a personal letter to the Pope soliciting approbation of the celebrated canon. He laments the protests of the legates, and accuses them of mistaking the true intentions of St. Leo with regard to the Holy Church of Constantinople. He declares, *"It is necessary that Your Holiness be informed of what took place.* This is why the Council and ourselves reported the text of the decree, *so as to obtain approbation and confirmation.* We pray you to give this approbation because *the See of Constantinople has as father your Apostolic Throne."*[14]

After St. Leo had rejected the canon, this same Anatolius wrote him another letter, dated 454, in which he declared that he had nothing to do with the drafting of the canon and that, moreover, that what had been done could not have any value without the Pope's confirmation.[15]

---

[12]) It is difficult to arrive at satisfactory translation of the word *presbeia.* In the canonical language of the patristic period, it has the general sense of *privileges* or *prerogatives.* Doubtless this meaning should be given the word in this place. In its context it has to do with patriarchal privileges. It should not then be translated as *the primacy or the the first place.* A confirmation for this interpretation is found in the imperial commissaries' declaration made at the last session for the purpose of quieting the wrath of the Roman legates. They said: "In view of what has been done, and because of the assent of each of the Fathers, we affirm above all that, according to the canons, the primacy, and honor without peer remain with the Archbishop of Old Rome." See Mansi, *op cit.*, VII, 451.

[13]) Mansi, VI, 147. P.L. LIV, 951 ff.: *Voces beati Petri omnibus constitutus interpres . . .*

(*Continued on page* 77)

After these declarations, it is easily understood that St. Leo gave slight attention to the drafted canon that now shocks us: *"For with full right the Fathers accorded to* (or: *recognized in*) *Old Rome the privileges* (or: *the first place*) *because that city was the dwelling place of the emperor."* Not deigning to defend his own cause, he insisted above all on the violation of the rights proper to the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch with regard to precedence. It was also a violation of the rights of the metropolitans of the three dioceses of Asia, Pontus, and Thrace. The Pope could hardly have supposed that those who wrote him with such great deference, bowed so humbly before his authority, and moreover expressly recognized his primacy of divine right could have had the intention of denying that same authority when they drafted their canon. In their action, he saw nothing more than an ambitious manoeuvre of the Bishop of Constantinople and of his clergy to assume a sort of primacy over all the Orient. On the other hand, he did not remain altogether silent on the deceitful canon that had been submitted. He wrote to the emperor Marcian as follows:

"May the city of Constantinople have the honour due it and, under divine protection, may she long enjoy the government of Your Clemency. However, the nature of secular matters is one thing, and that of divine matters another, and without the stone laid by the Lord, no edifice will stand firm. (Mt. 16;17.) He who covets that which is not due him loses those things which are his own. . . . Anatolius ought to be satisfied to hold, with the assistance of Your Piety and *my assent*, the episcopacy of such a great city. May he not scorn the imperial city, which he cannot make an apostolic see,[16] and may he forsake any hope in increasing his grandeur in any way that would be to the detriment of others."[17]

Here the Pope recalls quite clearly the divine origin of the Roman primacy and rejects the similarity of the new Rome to the old upon which the structure of the 28th canon rests.

Thus, the 28th canon, when fit into its historical background, far from diminishing the Oriental Church's belief in the Roman primacy, merely serves to place it in greater relief. To make of it a weapon against the Roman privileges, it must be separated from its historical context, and be taken in the sense of the words alone. It is this fallacy that is ordinarily committed by anti-Catholic polemicists of the East.[18]

Martin Jugie, A.A.

(*Continued from page 76*)
nobis tu quidem, sicut membris caput, prae-eras, in iis qui tuas vices gerebant benevolentiam praeferens . . . Tuae Sanctitati vineae custodia a Salvatore commissa est . . . Rogamus igitur, sic et Summitas Tua filiis quod decet adimpleat."

14) P.L., LIV, col. 984: "Nam sedes Constantinopolis habet patrem thronum apostolicum vestrum."

15) "Cum et sic gestorum vis omnis et confirmatio auctoritati vestrae Beatitudinis fuerit reservata." *P.L., LIV,* col. 1084.

16) It would seem that this passage could also be translated thus: *of which he is unable to make the Apostolic See,* in the sense of making the see of the New Rome equal to that of the Old.

17) *P.L.,* vol. LIV, col. 993-995: "Alia tamen est ratio rerum saecularium alia divinarum; nec praeter illam petram, quam Dominus posuit, stabilis erit ulla constructio. Propria perdit qui indebita concupiscit . . . Non dedignetur regiam civitatem, quam apostolicam non potest facere sedem, nec ullo speret modo per aliorum possit offensiones augeri."

18) Not all, however. One exception is the Russian Alexis Petrovitch Lebedev (1908,) who wrote a *History of the Church* in ten volumes. In Volume X, entitled: *The Clergy of the Ancient Universal Church,* Moscow, 1905, pp. 239-242, he sketches the development of the Roman primacy. When he arrives at the Council of Chalcedon he recognizes that the Oriental Church as well as the Emporer bowed before the amazing authority of Pope Leo in his abrogation of the 28th canon, and he concludes with this phrase: "Certain contemporaneous historians affirm generally that at the period of the Council of Chalcedon the concept of the papal primacy had arrived at the limits which it attained in the Middle Ages."

The Church and the Dissidents

This Article is the text of a lecture delivered by Fr. Joseph Ledit, S.J., for the Unitas *Association at Rome, April* 3, 1952.

We who are living in the year 1952 are not only witnesses of a singular crisis in the history of our race, but we are responsible participants in it. These are foreboding days when we consider how our civilization is menaced by the peril of destruction. They are days of reassuring hope if we see in them the unmistakable signs of God's providential hand at work. A characteristic of our days is the clarity with which the evil of divisions and dissensions among the sons of a single heavenly Father stand out. Clearer still is the inevitable remedy, which consists in a return to God through an acceptance of His all-embracing charity and His divinely revealed truth. We may say in other terms that spiritual unity in Christ's Mystical Body is the solution of the malady now ravaging the world, and the need of it is so grave and so universal that it is hard to see how any Christian may remain indifferent to it.

I rejoice in the movement of Unitas which has sprung up in Rome itself, reinforcing the general movement of Christian unity with the guarantee of her doctrinal solidity, and enlivening it with that super-national Roman charity which passes above and beyond regional frontiers, and carries the veritable peace of Christ to the afflicted hearts of the Christian family everywhere.

The first reason for our interest in Christian unity is evidently the fact that we are Christians. Jesus Christ founded one Church; there is but one Faith, one Baptism, one Eucharist, one Mystical Body, and one Christ. The advantage of being born within this unity brings with it an obligation to Christ that would crush us under its burden if at the same time we did not perceive in it a deeply comforting sign of love and mercy. Yet we must be ready to excuse failings in others that are not to be so easily pardoned in ourselves. The divisions between Christians are the fruit of that cursed cockle that was sown by the enemy, *inimicus homo.* When we consecrate ourselves to the healing of the wounds that these divisions have inflicted upon the Church, we work for the supreme desire of Jesus Christ, "that they all may be one," and for the making of a world as He willed it—a world of charity.

Christian unity should interest us for another reason. "Seek ye first the kingdom of God," Jesus said, "and all these things shall be added unto you." It seems obvious to me that divisions between Christians—first the Oriental schism, and then the Protestant revolution—prepared the ground for the present crisis of Communism through their deteriorating repercussion upon our civilization. They gave increment to false doctrines that spread and developed until they took shape in dialectical materialism. Now, thanks to our divisions, an uncertain and fragile world, motivated by interests perpetually in conflict, a world destined to collapse unless it right itself, attempts to oppose the communistic unity which becomes constantly stronger. If our European civilization is to survive, Christians of the Atlantic community must rediscover the spiritual unity which once fashioned our Europe. This unity, sealed by the concord of minds and hearts, will be a unity of

peace. Any unity imposed by materialistic conquest and terror would rob our world of its *raison d'être.*

The phenomenon of Communism has invaded every domain: philosophy, politics, economics, sociology, education. In each of these domains it proposes problems requiring immediate solutions, and consequently provisory solutions are often given. We agree, nevertheless, that it is necessary to free ourselves of the evils that provoked the coming of Communism and these are not essentially of the economical or material order.

One materialism cannot be overcome by another materialism. Spiritual forces must be mustered to win the battle, first in minds and hearts, then in the world about that will be transformed with the changing of the men that compose it. Such is the action of the Gospel leaven. It is a work to be accomplished over a long period of time, and a labor worthy of Christianity's best efforts.

It has to do with finding a field of common understanding and collaboration between Catholics and dissidents in the hope of reestablishing the spiritual unity of the West. We have often been accused of a harsh attitude toward those who have left the Church. It is precisely this attitude that we must examine first of all. Our inquiry should be made with a dispassionate regard for truth. In this inquiry, nothing is to be gained in collecting the scandals that might be dug up among the various Christian groups and hurling them at one another. Intelligent Protestants find no pleasure in reading about defrocked priests. It is obvious to all that they are castaways when they malign the Church that formed them, but castaways are not lacking in any body of Christians.

The Church is at once both divine and human: divine because the doctrine she preaches is revealed; the Sacraments that she administers were entrusted to her by Christ, and these are the source of supernatural life; the authority that she exercises is that of Him who said, "He that heareth you heareth me: and he that despiseth you despiseth me." She is human also because she is composed of men. Her priests are men who carry, like the others, the weight of human weakness and who stand in need of Christ's mercy.

I hardly think that we are given to rummaging Protestant trash piles for things that the Protestants have themselves rejected. Nor does it seem fair to me to blame us for what is done *against* the will and the teaching of the Church. May I be permitted an example taken from our Province of Quebec. In our penitentiary of St. Vincent of Paul, Quebec, the great majority of the prisoners are Catholics. The Protestant chaplain has practically nothing to do. Is this an argument against the Church? In the penitentiary of Kingston, in the neighbouring province of Ontario, the opposite is true, with the exception of a good number of Russian Doukhobors who have been locked up there.

In the United States and elsewhere there are politicians who have served time in prison. Still, the American political system, from many points of view, could be preferred to systems of many other countries. It has its problems. It would be an injustice to hold the Catholic religion responsible for its abuses. Is it reasonable, for example, to blame the Catholic Church for the disorders that can arise in municipalities composed principally of Catholics? If there are Catholic politicians who find themselves in an embarrassing situation, it is not because they have been faithful to their re-

ligion, but because they have forgot Christ for the sake of Mammon in the trials of their extremely difficult profession or because they have ceded to some one of the seven capital sins.

It has also been said that Communism has thrived especially in Catholic countries. To be fair, one should take cognizance of the fact that since the coming of liberalism, more than a century ago, these same countries have been strongly influenced by secret societies, especially by Masonry. This institution, which gained control of public life and relegated the clergy to the sacristy as far as it was able, bears a somewhat heavier burden of responsibility. This question is, by the way, all the more important because it has been so little studied. It seems to us quite clear that the numberless secret societies that flourished in continental Europe during the period of revolutionary romanticism, that is, during the first half of the last century, have lead to the Communism of 1948. But this is a subject for a detailed study, which we are now working upon for future publication.

When one recalls the polemical literature against the Catholic Church produced by the Protestants in the past, he is struck by the change that has taken place in the last few years. The old literature explained the Reformation by the corruption of the Catholic Church. Reference was made to the *gravamina* listed by the German Diets, and to the first Protestant pamphlets of England and Germany. A slightly more serious type of this sort of literature is found in the article *Reformation* published in the Hastings Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics. The author is H. M. Gwatkin, professor of ecclesiastical history at Cambridge. He reproaches the Church for her corruption:

> But the Church was full of scandals, moral, financial, and political; and these were the grievances which in the end compelled some to face the risk of heresy by questioning its doctrines. In the first place, the Hildebrandine reformation had failed to cleanse the Church. If celibacy was supposed to lift the priest above the mire of the world, auricular confession plunged him back into it, for the priest's ear became the sink of the parish. And the celibacy itself was full of dangers, on which we must not enlarge, for the grossness of the Middle Ages cannot be told in decent language. (p. 610)

May these few lines suffice. This is not the time to discuss what is true or false in his statements. The conclusion of M. Gwatkin would seem to be that these abuses flow from the very stuff of which the Church is made. It is enough to remark that all these reproaches are inapplicable to the Catholic Church today. It is almost impossible, excepting for isolated regions, or in very extraordinary instances, to remain a priest and be depraved. When Hitler held his morality trials against the Church he had every means at his disposal for unearthing or inventing scandals, and for summoning false witnesses. Even so, he was not able to condemn more than about four percent of the German priests. We feel justified, therefore, in concluding that the Church, through her own forces, has rid herself of what, according to the above cited author, was a principal cause of the Protestant Reformation. In this we have evidence that corruption did not spring from the nature of the Church.

Here is another complaint—I cite the same author:

> Yet, after all, more offence was caused by the worldliness of the many than by the flagrant vice of not a few. The wealth of the Church was

> enormous. In Sweden it held two-thirds of the land, and perhaps one third or two fifths in England, when the accumulation had been checked by the Statute of Mortmain (p. 610) . . . Meanwhile, the ordinary friar was little better than a vulgar mountibank, puffing his pardons and relics as impudently as any other quack of the market-place (611.)

We omit here what one could and should say on the use the Church made of her goods. In the Middle Ages, she cared for the poor, the orphans, the aged, and the sick. She was alone in maintaining schools; all the famous universities of Europe were founded by her. I have often heard the same difficulty formulated against colonial Mexico where the goods of the Church were used for the Indians. Today, in all lands, excepting North America, the Church has been completely despoiled of her possessions at least once. In more than one country, especially in those lands that our Protestant friends like to qualify as "Catholic," this has happened several times. A good illustration is a story once told me about the Mexican Jesuits: at Puebla they now occupy their sixth college, after having had five former colleges taken from them. The Church today stands before us in her poverty. During the last war, we saw how the American Catholics collected millions for the relief of the war victims. They did not mention indulgences; there was no question of pardon, nor relics. An appeal was simply made to charity. We remark in passing that for some centuries we have not heard complaints about indulgences that have been conferred for an offering. Even so, charitable offerings cover sins, according to Holy Scripture. We feel confident then, that the Church has entirely freed herself of what it is claimed was one of the essential causes of the Reformation.

> The Church also constantly interfered in matters of high policy, forbidding wars, reconciling wars, and not uncommonly stirring them up. If a King was disobedient, he must be rebuked, or in graver cases interdicted or excommunicated, and even deposed and his Kingdom given to another. (p. 612.)

Again, this is not the place to study relations between the spiritual and the temporal worlds of the Middle Ages. In 1870, with the States of Europe consenting, the Church lost the Pontifical States. She accepted the Conciliation of 1929 that established the seat of the pontifical sovereignty in the City of the Vatican. She has no more territorial interests to defend; she has neither army nor navy. This is the only state in the world that does not rely upon force, but exclusively on juridical guarantees. Only the Bolsheviks accuse it of inciting wars, while everyone else knows that the Holy See strives to promote peace among the nations. It could be that in the past the Popes excommunicated princes for political reasons. Such a thing is inconceivable in our days. Catholics have likewise been accused of divided loyalties—to their own country and to a foreign sovereign. Since the Pope has no political and territorial interests to defend, this claim falls into absurdity. However, it can be said that Communism requires a divided loyalty: that which one gives to his native land, and that which he gives, often with more ardent and more whole-hearted enthusiasm, to the "world fatherland of the proletariat." In like manner, many Jews would find themselves in a painful situation if they were obliged to choose and the case is not impossible—between the political interests of Israel and those of their own country of which they are citizens. Double authority, religious and political, was recognized until 1914, without any objections being raised,

in the case of the Czar of Russia, head of the Orthodox Church in his country and protector of Orthodoxy. Like authority has been acknowledged in the Sultan who was as well the religious head of Islam, and of the King of England, *caput ecclesiae anglicanae*. Only the Pope's sovereignty would not be tolerated, and this was one of the great iniquities of the last century. During the last war, Catholics in all countries proved their entire loyalty to the flag under which they fought. Rare cases of conscientious objectors did occur, but far less among the Catholics than elsewhere. If they made the sacrifice of going to prison for civil disobedience, they met at Dachau, Buchenwald and other such places members and ministers of other Christian groups with whom they fraternized in love of Christ. It may happen at times that a Catholic puts his influence to the service of some political scheme; more frequently we will find statesmen who interest themselves in religion to restrain it, persecute it, who prefer to see Christ harnessed to their chariots.

Here is a last quotation:

> Its methods, to begin with, of anonymous accusation, concealment of charges, inquisitorial questioning, torture on suspicion, and indefinite imprisonment were a terror to the innocent. The soundest Catholic ran a risk of the fire if somebody reported that he had eaten meat in Lent (p. 612.)

Our author's account abounds in many other terrifying details. Certainly we are glad that in our days no one is killed for his ideas excepting behind the Iron Curtain, and until recently in Nazi Germany. One still finds often enough certain practices of ostracism from public functions for religious motives. May I be permitted to observe that this is rarer among Catholics than elsewhere. More than once it has happened that there have been atheistic or theosophic presidents in Latin America; it would seem quite a difficult thing for a Catholic to occupy the throne of England or of any Scandinavian Kingdom, much less the presidency of the Soviet Union, and there is no immediate likelihood of a Catholic being elected president of the United States. A Jew in recent times became mayor of Rome. The Catholic Church in the Twentieth Century has known torture and imprisonment on a grand scale; she has inflicted it upon no one. Let it not be said that this "transformation" has been imposed from outside by a more liberal Protestantism, because one would risk plunging into sterile discussion, where accusation and counter-accusation would risk evoking the atmosphere of the religious wars. Moreover, historians are aware that the real religious vitality of the Catholic Church must be attributed to the Council of Trent and to the spiritual and mystical fervor which sprang from it. A considerable part of the ground lost at that period has been regained by purely spiritual means. It seems to us, therefore, that today the Church is in a position to address those who left her and say to them: "You accused me, with or without reason, of many things at the time you separated fom me. Can you accuse me of these things today? I have wished to rid myself even of the appearance of those things which could scandalize you. If anything still remains, tell me." This does not seem to me to be a totalitarian, intransigent attitude. On the other hand, many Protestants and many Catholics are now doing what they can to forget that atmosphere of the wars of religion, and are generously collaborating in the task of doing away with the evils that modern paganism has produced. There is

nothing Christian in the commercialization of drunkenness, gambling, the vice of impurity, in the perversion of youth by unclean spectacles, indecent dancing, and the exploitation of the lowest passions for the sake of monetary gain. We know a Protestant minister who has a special gift for taking care of drunkards. He treats them with a charity that we could well envy. When he has to do with a Catholic, he does not criticize the Church, but sends a man to a priest for confession.

The article from which I quoted at length was written in 1918. Since that time such polemics have been discarded in educated circles. The true problem is rather that of finding the solutions for concrete problems which we inherit from these last four centuries of division. The need of unity is felt the world over. We are criticized rather for not entering into the ecumenical movement on the basis of an equal footing with the other 200 or 250 Christian confessions. It seems to me that here we have a misunderstanding that should be explained. I have always found that the positive religious values embraced by other Christian confessions can all be found in the Catholic Church. The other confessions in certain cases add *national* values to them, sometimes even very admirable *human* values, but above all they insist upon negations. There are Anglo-Catholics who do not accept the authority of the Pope but insist upon the Mass, the first Friday of the month, the hours of adoration, the rosary, confession and communion. Others discard the Mass and penance, but maintain a communion service, while still others put aside the liturgical life almost entirely, limiting themselves to sermons and hymns, and these it is not our wont to neglect. There are those who are interested in the corporal healing that religion can effect. This we have at Lourdes, Fatima, and at numberless national sanctuaries throughout the world. Every month the Messenger of the Sacred Heart, the Annals of St. Anne of Beaupré and a host of other publications print accounts of extraordinary graces received. Besides these published accounts, there are the cures obtained through the application of holy water, of the Miraculous Medal, through the intervention of St. Anthony, or by some blessing from the Ritual. These are proclaimed only by those individuals who receive them. Last year I had the good fortune to visit a colony of Hutterites in the United States. They are Anabaptists of the first period of Protestantism who, after a stay in Moravia, emigrated to Transylvania, and from there, under Catherine II, to Russia. During the second half of the last century they emigrated to the United States and Canada. They practice integral communism, and are, for this reason, a national curiosity. The women wear a headdress from hundreds of years ago. A tailor or seamstress makes the clothes for the community with cloth bought by the treasurer, or perhaps woven by themselves. The women wear the same costume that was worn in Thuringia or Swabia at the time of Charles V. The little girls of three or four years go about barefoot looking like little dolls dressed like grandmothers of four centuries ago. In spite of the two centuries spent in Russia, when it would seem they learned not one word of the language of the country, they still speak an ancient German, sing the same hymns, preach the same sermons, composed once and for all by their founder Jacob Hutter, avoid the contamination of the world by fleeing the schools, the towns and villages, and stay on their land which becomes beautifully cultivated and rich. For my part, I cannot help feeling touched by their attachment to a past made venerable by its heroic episodes. Are

there 7,000 of them in the whole world? I hardly think so. When I was among them I seemed to see before my eyes our hundreds of thousands of religious, both men and women—the Jesuits alone number more than 30,000—who practice, personally and without imposing it upon the members of their family, a still more integral communism.

We have not yet come upon one sole truly religious element which does not have its equivalent in the Catholic Church. Why then should we be asked to abandon this universal treasure that was confided to us by Our Lord Jesus Christ, for which we are responsible to Him, for the sake of joining in a search with others for a common religious basis, that would run a grave risk of becoming a common negation? Unity cannot be the rejection of revealed truths, one after the other, to arrive at a reconciliation with those who deny them. On the contrary, it does mean that all the riches of the Christian heritage should be gathered into a living unity so that they will radiate the fullness of their value. We have so many things in common with these other groups that it would seem possible, with goodwill, always to find a common ground of partial understanding, but one which must remain partial as long as they have not entered into the fullness of Catholic faith.

We must—it is necessary if our Western civilization is not to perish—clearly establish these fields of common understanding with our Protestants friends. This can hardly be done by the way of discussions which could become bitter, or in uneasy, uncomfortable conferences in which the speakers feel they must withhold something of their thought. We must gain their confidence by the brightness of our light, the flavor of the salt that Jesus left with us, and by the generosity of our charity. All of us, I am sure, should criticize ourselves for having served Our Lord very poorly. At the beginning of this study we did not discuss the generalized affirmations of Mr. Gwatkin. They seemed to us to be more of a caricature than anything else. Nevertheless, it is true that Machiavelli preceded the Protestant Reformation, and that the hero he describes in his Prince was Caesar Borgia. Our first contribution will always be the depth of our interior life. When spiritual life is intense, it tends to overflow. It is encouraging to see our Anglo-Catholic friends discovering our saints—those who followed the Protestant Revolution, and even those who opposed it: St. Peter Canisius, the English Martyrs, and more recently, St. Therese of Lisieux. It would not surprise us if they should take up the cult of St. Maria Goretti. They love our devotions, our holy hours, our nocturnal adorations. If we cooperate with grace, they will not remain untouched by the presence of the Holy Ghost in our souls and in the Church. Egoism is terribly contagious; it has always caused destructive evil. But charity is also divinely contagious and it is charity that will open wide the hearts of those who now look upon us distrustfully.

Conversations with Protestants demand of us all the supernatural effort that we are capable of with God's grace, but the bonds of charity that we must form with the souls now dwelling behind the Iron Curtain demand a still more costly effort. There are two points of contact between our countries and the Soviet Union: one is human; it lies in the community of our nature, of our human interests, as well as in our hopes and in our fears of a possible catastrophe. This human contact, it would seem, can be developed in two ways: First, by diplomatic relations, but the experience of recent years

has too often shown this way to be futile. Some have preferred to enter into relation with Soviet organizations with the intention of collaborating with them, either in our countries, or behind the Iron Curtain. It has always been my opinion that as long as present circumstances prevail, this means nothing more or less than the ultimate swallowing up of individuals or small organizations by the formidable Communistic organization. Such unequal contact must eventually terminate in a capitulation of Christianity to atheism. It is precisely this that we must avoid if we do not wish to run the risk of betraying Christ.

But it must not be forgotten that a Christian Church does exist behind the Iron Curtain, albeit a dissident one, that has retained much of genuine early Christianity, and which in these last years has enjoyed a measure of toleration. We shall now treat of our bonds with this Church.

In considering the religious factor of Russia's isolation, one must take into account the psychological division that has been wrought by seven centuries of separation from us. An abyss has been cleft between us that seems to be of unfathomable depth. During these centuries when the Russian Church has been out of contact with Rome and the West, she has grown and developed under the tension of rigorous solitude. With its sphere of activity severely curtailed, she has strained all her forces toward the magnificence of religious art in all its forms. She has created a cult of extraordinary beauty. It acquires an added fascination from the conditions under which her artistic impulse is engendered, for it springs forth irrepressibly, spontaneously, in delightfully ethereal forms under the ponderous weight of the immense, brutally centralized governmental system. Russia treasures jealously this religious culture, which she first nurtured in one of the darkest moments of her history, with which she has bedecked herself in awesome splendor—for the Sun of divine light transfigures any civilization upon which it casts its rays. In these last years, the Russian Church has undergone perhaps the most fearful persecution of her history. She feels that she has overcome it; she grows anew, tentatively, like a tender snow plant in an uncertain season that is not yet springtime. She will protect this religious heritage, the most precious gem of her national patrimony, like a mother protects her child. It is our task to succeed in persuading the Russian Christians that nothing that they love is menaced, that nothing impedes them from retaining their national loyalty to their past. They may retain as well their religious loyalty to the extent that it is not incompatible with the universality of the Church. But if they subordinate Christ to their country, even in those things which are most precious of their national spirit, then they serve neither Russia nor Christ, but betray one and the other. It seems that this task, which might appear to be impossible of realization, should be approached with truth and charity, and especially beseeching God's help, since human means, as far as we can judge, are altogether inadequate.

We should begin with truth, for we know the Russians have been made suspicious by an interminable past of prejudices and misunderstandings. They fear that our intention in obliging them to accept the authority of the Pope is to enslave the very soul of Russia. Here we might well recall the statement made at the celebration at Moscow in the summer of 1948 in honour of the fifth centenary of Moscow's autocephaly. It is another concept of unity that they have, and it is impossible for us to pass

over it in silence. The Pope has reminded us of the persecution of the Catholic Ukrainian Church; he has recently praised the constancy of our Romanian Catholic Bishops, all in prison because of their faith. The opposition is now busily at work trying to break down our Hungarian, Czech, Slovak, Carpatho-Russian, Albanian, and Chinese Catholics. Such Sovietic religious unity may be considered as a political success if one has an appreciation for brute force and the expediency of slavery. It cannot be that which Jesus implored at the very moment when he entered into his agony at Gethsemane. It is the unity of violence, but how are we to make the Christians of Russia understand this? They become still more distrustful when they see us adopt their national rite. In their eyes it is a matter of trickery, committed with the intention of winning them over and then perverting them. Nevertheless, the Catholic Church is obliged necessarily to follow this course. She cannot oblige the Russians who come to her to make themselves expatriates, not only of their country, but of the very soul of their nation, as would be the case if they should assume the western rite which is foreign to them. But how to convince the Russians, émigrés or Soviets, that we do not look upon this national rite, their heritage, intertwined with the whole history of their fatherland, as a mere instrument to win them over, but rather as the most precious thing their people has produced, and that which should rightfully remain not only as something tolerated, but as something proper to the unity willed by Christ, and which He commanded of His disciples on the night when He instituted the Eucharist? Above all, how are we to make them understand that the Pope is not a conspirator, but a father, that he does not bless atomic bombs, nor enter into political pacts, that he knows full well that they would lower the divine work of the Redemption to the level of Pilate, of Barabbas, or of the Pharisees? How to convince them of our belief that Jesus Christ entrusted Him with the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, but that he is the *Servus Servorum Christi*, that he needs our prayers and asks for them, so as to be able to fulfill his lofty spiritual mission? And how to make them understand that our Catholic priests of Byzantine-Slav rite are not wolves in sheep's clothing, but that they have sacrificed all to consecrate themselves to the sublime work of forming a synthesis of Russia and the Universal Church? If, with God's help, we succeed in bringing them to see this light, and in projecting it into the heart of Russia, on that day one of the greatest works of the world's history will have been begun. Once these prejudices have been dissipated, the cause of unity will go ahead in long, swift strides.

Russia will accept this truth when she recognizes in us the disinteredness of that greater love of one who gives his life for those whom he loves. Herein lies the remedy for the schism which is a sin against charity. Thus, the obligation of sanctity that Jesus imposes upon those who wish to follow Him and give witness to Him comes back again and again and forever. There is no other remedy. Human calculations fade away before the immensity of this task, and the gigantic problem of unity *hic et nunc* is always resolved in an effort of sanctification. Fundamentally, it is a problem of individual sanctification which has an immediate effect in its radiation within the Mystical Body of Christ. "And for them do I sanctify myself; that they also may be sanctified in truth." We repeat these words of Christ with all confidence, in the knowledge that He spoke them

just before entering into His Passion, and directly after the offering of Himself at the Last Supper. Perhaps our selfish, sinful race must pass through still more tribulation before this spiritual unity is attained; perhaps we must be still further humbled by divine chastisements before we will finally renounce our petty greed, and relinquish our wretched material interests—all the more despicable when they are paraded under the disguise of altruistic niceties. The real builders of world unity, of that UNITAS for which we pray, are our martyrs. Catholics and Protestants got to know one another in Hitler's prisons. Countless numbers of our peoples deported to the Ural, to the banks of the White Sea, and to the steppes of Siberia are now learning something of the soul of Russia; through the infinite suffering endured in their labor camps they are penetrating to its depths. We make a profound reverence to them in their tribulation. In it we find a spark of hope, we who are feeble, sluggish, petty calculators in generosity, because in Christ these heroes are our brothers.

JOSEPH LEDIT, S.J.

Kyrie Eleison*

A PRAYER

We have exulted in many conquests, but still we find ourselves naked, feeble wanderers. Without You we are without love, and without joy. Without You the soul's fire and the spirit's light are extinguished, and life is emptied of hope. Darkness surrounds us, fear for tomorrow chills our heart. All our victories are turned to loss. What we had been pleased to contrive and do with our own forces has been undone. The tower of Babel, the tower of our blind energies, has crumbled again; tongues are divided, minds confused; heavy clouds bar the horizon.

You came as a beggar knocking at our heart. You found it already occupied, filled with philosophical systems, positive sciences, and political projects. There was no welcome for You in the fortress of our vain-glory, no place for You in the temple of our clay idols. Time and again You tried to gather us about You like a hen gathers in her chicks, and we resisted Your soft voice. How could we bear the purity of Your glance, we who liked crawling in the mire? What use to us was Your innocence, love, and meekness?

This was our world, we thought, and we chose to build with hatred; we wanted to live our lives far from Heaven. There were You in our way. We pushed You out of the circle of our inane aspirations. Like the Pharisees, we despised You; like Judas we gave You a traitor's kiss. We oppressed You until You sweat blood; we spat upon You, and flagellated You; we slapped that holy image of Your beauty. Like the vilest criminal we nailed You on a cross. We used the lips You gave us to blaspheme You. These eyes You made for us were glad when they saw You lined up with men who were to be banished from the earth.

And how we worked to get You buried! We set all our higher sciences to the task of getting You buried and out of sight! We rolled down the rocks of our ingenious philosophical systems upon You thinking to keep You covered forever. We wanted to obliterate the very memory of You under a heap of scientific hypotheses. We solemnly lowered over the mouth of Your sepulchre a final massive slab, the comparative history of religions.

All this was not enought to make You regret having come down to live among us. Neither the blindness of our soul, nor the darkness of our mind, nor the hideousness of our loathing were enough to shatter Your infinite love for us. Yet it is You, in Your longsuffering love and goodness, who hold the dust of our nothingness carefully in Your hands.

O Jesus, give us a share of Your patience! You are our hope, high above every human hope, like a rock towering above the beating waves, like a mountain peak piercing the mass of clouds. In this black, oppressive night, give us hope in the light; in this tormented life, give us belief in happiness. While we walk through a world of evil, help us to gather goodness into our hearts. Plagued by doubts, ravaged by pains and sorrows, may our faith be made strong, our dwindling love be nourished, our shaken hope be sustained. Lift up this soul lying in the ruins of its dreams, teach it to walk erect before Your face, draw it ever toward You in the expectation of Your eternal embrace! Deign to fill our famished heart with

* Translation of *Isus* published in the Rumanian periodical *Indreptar*, Dec., 1951.

Your beauty, far above all earthly beauty, with the splendor that fills the wondering eyes of the angels in Heaven.

O Lord, be the mainstay of our weakness. Come down again into the grotto of our sorrow, and with Your light dispel the night of our despair. Let the star of Bethlehem, the herald of Your birth and our return to You, shine upon our dimmed eyes. Send Your angels once again to sing the hymn of peace in our hearts; let them come bearing on their wings the message of liberation. Show us the way to find what is not to be found in schemes for rearmament and news of impending wars, but solely on the threshold of Your poor grotto, the sure foundation of hope. You alone are able to renew Your creature: without You our calculations are futile, our science blind, and our life a shadowy dream.

Alexander Mircea

Comments and Documents

"VERITATEM FACIENTES"

Apostolic Letter of His Holiness Pius XII, by Divine Providence Pope. To our venerable brothers and beloved sons, the Bishops, other clergy, and people of Romania enjoying peace and communion with the Apostolic See.

Venerable Brothers and Beloved Children,
Health and Apostolic Benediction

"Doing the truth in charity" (Eph. 4, 15,) as We consider the very pitiful condition of the Catholic Church in your country, We cannot refrain from extolling the admirable example of Christian fortitude which you are giving, nor from voicing the affliction of Our soul at the very grave dangers which beset the sacred rights of the Catholic religion and especially its liberty. For this reason, the fatherly love which We cherish towards all those who are Our Brothers and Our children in Christ and particularly towards you, urges Us to offer to you such comforts as We can in the present difficulties: namely, to speak to you by means of this letter as if you were present, assuring you that We share your trials and sufferings and that, on your behalf, in union with the supplications of the entire Catholic world, We are offering Our prayers to God, the Father of mercies.

But Our consciousness of the Apostolic charge entrusted to Us obliges Us likewise to raise Our voice in defense of the cause of God and of His Church; "For we can do nothing against the truth: but for the truth" (II Cor. 13, 8.) We well know, indeed, how many and how great sufferings you have had to bear up to the present; We know that now there is no longer any Bishop amongst you who is in a position to govern his diocese freely, to direct his priests or to give suitable directions and instructions to the laity committed to his care. For all of them have been forcibly removed from their Sees, and are either in prison or banished far away from their flocks. Therefore, with deplorable harm, there is verified the scriptural phrase: "I will smite the shepherd and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered" (Matt. 26,31; cfr. Zach. 13,7.) We are aware, futhermore, that the Church of Oriental Rite, so flourishing in your midst both in the numbers and the virtues of its faithful, is regarded by the law as abolished, and its sacred edifices and institutes have been destined for other uses, as if this were in accordance with the desires and aspirations of the people themselves; very many religious families, both of men and of women, have been dispersed; the schools wherein, under the guidance of those Religious, the young opened their minds to human and Christian wisdom and grew in integrity of morals and in the practice of virtue, have been proscribed, as if they were dangerous and harmful to the nation, and given over to others; many priests, because of their attachment to the faith of their ancestors and to this Apostolic See, and because they would in no wise consent to weaken in their Christian steadfastness, to sully their consciences or to betray their duty, have either been deported to unknown destinations far away from their country, or condemned to forced labour, or thrown into prison, where they are today leading a life that is miserable but one that is glorious in the eyes of God and of the just.

To this there is added that amidst so great a mass of books, of newspapers and of printed leaflets, no opportunity is given to Catholics to

use the press in order to make their voice felt and thereby to make the truth shine forth and have the sacred rights of the Church presented in their proper light and protected in so far as possible.

Hence it is easy to so describe and present the Catholic Church as if it were an enemy dangerous to the public welfare. And yet it is quite clear that those who rightly follow the precepts of Christianity and strive to apply them as far as they can in their daily lives, are second to none in their love of fatherland, in respect for civil authority, in obedience to public regulations, provided these latter are not opposed to the natural, divine, or ecclesiastical laws.

And if meanwhile you, Venerable Brethren and beloved children, are afflicted by persecutions and by every kind of tribulation because of your will to preserve intact in your souls the Catholic faith, this redounds not to your shame and infamy but to your honour and glory. To Us, and to as many as are able to know the truth and make their voices freely heard, you seem to be living again the glorious deeds of the early Church; and thus it is that We Who have a paternal affection for your people, and embrace with a very special love those "who suffer persecution for justice' sake" (Matth. V, 10,) wish to kiss the chains of those who, unjustly imprisoned, are in tears and afflicted more by reason of attacks against religion, of the destruction of sacred institutions, and of the endangering of the eternal salvation of their people, than by their own suffering and loss of liberty.

Raise your eyes and minds with confidence to Heaven; remember, Venerable Brethren and beloved children, that there above a reward awaits you that is the light of eternal blessedness; realize that all Catholics in every part of the world together with Ourselves, the Common Father, are directing fervent supplications to God, that He in His goodness may hasten the end of such great sorrow and suffering, and may grant to souls, to peoples, to all nations, peace: that peace which assures the sacred rights of religion, which defends the dignity and liberty of the individual conscience, that joins together in friendship all peoples, without any distinction. This is the peace that We desire and which we have been recommending for so long a time, by word, exhortations and labours; not that peace which reduces the Church to slavery, knowing well that, with the oppression of religion, the very foundations of society are shaken and citizens are unable to attain to a true prosperity and happiness.

Already in the annals of your fatherland there have been shining examples of faith, constancy and Christian fortitude. Indeed, it has been handed down that in most remote time "there were at Durostoro, at Axiopoli and at Tomi martyrs who shed their blood for the name of Christ. And although no other facts are known of their lives other than the martyrdom which they suffered, this fact itself, being unquestionable, speaks with sufficient eloquence" (A.A.S. 1937, p. 481.) You are in a certain sense the children of these martyrs and therefore, "my beloved brethren, be ye steadfast and unmovable: always abounding in the work of the Lord, knowing that your labour is not in vain in the Lord" (I Cor. XV, 58.)

And just as your soil was purpled by the blood of martyrs, so also was it bedewed with the sweat of apostolic labours. Among those who, regardless of toil involved, brought to you the Christian faith and veneration for wisdom both human and divine, there stands out in particular Saint Nicetus, the Bishop of Remesiana, who, around the end of the fourth and the beginning

of the fifth century, was the indefatigable apostle of your people. Through his labours your forefathers learned "to acclaim Christ with Roman fervour and to live soberly in the tranquillity of peace" (St. Paulinus of Nola, Carmen XVII: Migne P.L., 61, 488-489.) He not only instructed your ancestors in the teachings of the Gospel and in the practice of Christian virtue but also left to posterity a testimony of his outstanding, learning, since "he composed with clear and limpid style" works of no little importance (cfr. Gennadius, De viris illus. C. 22; Migne P.L., 58, 1073.)

And if, down through the course of the centuries, access to this Apostolic See was rendered almost entirely impossible for your people by reason of most regretable circumstances, nevertheless the Catholic faith was never extinguished in your midst; rather, as soon as it became possible, it began to flourish once again, as if faithfully responding to the call of bygone times.

It is for you, Venerable Brethren and beloved children, to listen to this same voice and to imitate these same examples. Undoubtedly there will be difficulties, obstacles, and dangers; but your forefathers were not without experiencing these, and they succeeded in overcoming them. Continue, then, as you are doing, to bear with unbending fortitude of soul persecution, sufferings, and misery; continue to suffer exile, imprisonment and the loss of every possession rather than betray your faith and break or loosen the bond that unites you to this Apostolic See. And be firmly confident that the divine assistance, implored in prayer, will never be lacking to you.

We trust that these exhortations of Ours, this proof of Our most ardent affection, will come to your knowledge, and that you will all receive salutary strength and supernatural comfort from them so that you may continue to give a shining proof of that unconquerable steadfastness which so distinguishes you.

What is at stake, as is quite obvious, is the cause of God, of the Church and of souls; hence you must never lose heart, you must never belittle or transgress the obligations imposed by Christian conscience and by the commandments of God, but must ever respect them with supreme constancy and unfailing zeal and put them into practice with all your strength. Those Saints who are the glory of your fatherland will certainly assist you with their most efficacious protection and their powerful patronage: the Virgin Mary Mother of God, to whom you have such ardent devotion, will extend to you from Heaven her special assistance, and will obtain for you from her only begotten Son those divine favours of which you, her children who are in such grave danger, have need; lastly Our prayers and those of the whole Catholic world will assist you and, forming a sacred crusade, as it were, will beseech from the Father of mercies that which We and you and all those of goodwill desire: namely, the full liberty to proclaim your religion in public and in private and to uphold its institutions, its norms, and its precepts.

May Our Apostolic Blessing, which from the fulness of Our heart We impart to you in the Lord, Venerable Brethren and beloved children, as an earnest of heavenly graces and as a token of Our paternal affection, obtain this for you.

Given at Rome, at St. Peter's, March 27, 1952, the 14th year of Our Pontificate.

LETTER OF A ROMANIAN DISSIDENT METROPOLITAN TO THE PATRIARCH OF MOSCOW

The dissdent Metropolitan Vissarion Puiu of Chrisinau, Romania, now living in exile, addressed a letter to the Patriarch of Moscow last November. The letter, of which we have received a copy, deals with the materialism which is to be found everywhere in the world in our days and deals with the aggressive materialism of Soviet Russia in particular. It also touches upon the problem of world peace. The Metropolitan says in this regard: "... the peace movement undertaken recently by the Patriarchate of Moscow, impelled by political and not religious considerations, and animated by hostility with regard to other religions, notably with regard to Catholicism, is a naiveté which the Patriarchate of Moscow should renounce since such an action is not backed up by the necessary moral authority. The religious persecutions and the hostility which we find carried on with such great fury against the Sister Church of Rome deprives the political leaders and the Patriarch of Moscow of the right to say that they desire peace."

Below we quote some of the Metropolitan's conclusions. They are interesting since they illustrate what a dissident prelate not under Communistic domination might wish to say to the Patriach Alexis, and how he might express himself with regard to the Roman Church.

"Does the Patriarchate of Moscow desire to undertake purely religious activities, but which go beyond the confines of his local obligations (designed to heal the wounds inflicted upon his Church by Communism) and worthy of a Christian Patriarchate, upon which he may afterward strenghten his moral (and not political) authority, and which could give some grounds to its claim to being regarded as the Third Rome?"

The Metropolitan then proceeds to suggest how such activities could be carried out:

"The Patriarchate of Moscow should support the Orthodox patriarchates in such wise that they might lift themselves from the state in which they now find themselves, and thus become not only the depositaries of Orthodox doctrine, but also organs for its diffusion.

"It should determine upon and support (as does the Catholic Church) activity for the enlightenment of the human intelligence through Christianity, which is ignored by the higher culture (so greatly altered) of western Europe. From this lack (of a knowledge of the Christian faith) derive all the present intellectual and moral errors which now lead the peoples to materialism, parisitism, and back to the state of savagery in such wise that they need to be re-Christianized.

"It should teach the Soviet regime that although the manifestation of religious sentiment of all doctrines can be impeded, and perhaps altered, it can never be destroyed. The 30 years of a savagely hostile attitude toward Christianity and the Russian Church makes this truth sufficiently evident.

"It should insist that all political and religious persecutions within as well as outside the Soviet territories should cease, since the first consequence of Christianity is peace with the Sister-Church of Rome, which for many centuries, with extraordinary ability, and more than any other group, has striven for the realization of the Christian ideal, of peace and social harmony in the whole world.

"It should support, in collaboration with all the other patriarchates and with the heads of other religions, political laws of that genuine social character necessary for every people, laws founded upon Christian principles proper to each people, and that cannot be replaced by feeble and ephemeral political inventions springing from cheap, pretended ideologies, and particularly from communism.

"It should give its support to activities in favor of Christian reunion and activities tending to reestablish friendly relations with all the religions of the world, beginning with the Latin Church.

"It should teach to the world that secret and even public societies now existing in certain countries, and which are hostile to Christianity for reason of a crass ignorance of its doctrine, are like a cancer devouring the social and political foundations of these peoples.

"It should collaborate with the higher institutions of culture and with the world organisms of justice to abolish all erroneous or unjust political actions which have in view military attacks or conquests to the detriment of other peoples, and thus contribute to the establishment of true peace, indispensable to the entire world.

"The whole world looks with horror and compassion upon the sufferings which the political regime of Moscow causes, without motive and without provocation, to the institutions of the Roman Church in various lands, and admires the resignation with which she supports them not by counter-attacks of the press, but by prayers, being convinced that these (afflictions) will pass as did the persecutions of Napoleon and of Hitler, because the Holy Christian Church is eternal. She leaves their gravity to be decided by the judgment of history, and of God.

"I am and I remain within the framework of my Orthodox Church, but I affirm loudly and firmly that the Roman Church, by the superiority of her organization, by the multitude of her cultural and welfare institutions, and by her missionary efforts throughout the world, ought to be admired, befriended, and not persecuted. The end of all the Christian Churches ought to be the fulfillment of the desire of Our Lord Jesus Christ: 'That they all may be one.' "

A STATEMENT OF LUTHERAN BELIEF BY A LUTHERAN

A statement of Lutheran doctrine, at least in its principal points, appeared in the Fraternité Evangelique *of Paris (Easter number of* 1952.) *This exposition of Lutheran belief, composed by R. Woff, Ecclesiastical Inspector of Strasbourg, is one of a series of articles dedicated to the Assembly of the Lutheran World Federation which is to take place at Hanover in August of this year. We are publishing our own translation of the major part of this article for the benefit of those among our readers who would like to know how a Lutheran theologian would formulate his doctrine at the present day, especially in view of the policy frequently expressed by Lutherans that they should foster live contact with universal Christendom without, however, ceasing to defend loyally their particular confessional heritage.*

The author begins thus: "The great Lutheran doctrinal beliefs deposited in the credal writings of the 16th century, developed in dogmatic treatises, preached to the faithful, taught to the children, are, in line of first importance, all the great Christian doctrinal beliefs."

The sense of the fundamental doctrines is in general accord with Catholic teaching:

"We believe in one sole God, the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost. We think that there is no place in the Christian Church for a notion of God which would be that of the Mohammedans or of the 'Gottglaubige' of 1933 who pretended that they can know God without recourse to His revelation in Jesus Christ, and the witness of His Holy Ghost in the Bible.

"We believe that God the Son became man, was conceived of the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary. We believe that after having suffered for our sins he arose from the dead and that he reigns at the right hand of God until He will come to judge the living and the dead on the day established by God for the consummation of all things."

After rejecting that liberalism which would diminish the concept of Jesus Christ as the Incarnate Son of God, according to Phillipians II, 5-11, the text continues:

"We affirm with the ancient Church and with all the greater Christian confessions that there is an eternal hope, a Last Judgment, a resurrection of the body, a life without end and without sin for the believers. We reject, therefore, all attempts to reduce Christian hope to a vague idealism which would be satisfied in affirming the immortality of the soul while forgetting the essential passages of Scripture such as I Corinthians, XV, and II Corinthians, V."

A will to rapprochement with Catholic liturgical tradition is manifested in the statements on worship.

"In its Divine Service the Lutheran Church lays great stress upon the bond which unites it to the universal Church. In maintaining the liturgical responses which come down to her from the ancient Church, and which are also found in the Roman Mass, she is not performing a sort of archeological work, but rather is giving witness to her ecumenical concern. She wishes to preserve her bonds with the Church of all times and all places. Such is the sense of the *Kyrie* and the *Gloria*, of the *Sanctus* and of the *Agnus Dei*, which sometimes trouble our Protestant brethren. Moreover, we are glad to observe the fact that the Reformed Church of France, after the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, and the *Church and Liturgy* movement in French-speaking Switzerland, for the greater part, in their new eucharistic liturgy, find this contact with the universal Church."

The following points contain affirmations which vary from Catholic doctrine chiefly by reason of their limitations or negations:

"The great Lutheran doctrinal beliefs, in line of second importance, are the great evangelical doctrinal beliefs proclaimed by all the Churches of the Reformation:

"The Bible is the sole rule of faith and Christian life. Christ is the sole mediator between holy God and sinful man: Pardon is a free gift of God; it cannot be acquired by works of piety, nor by works of charity, nor by the exemplary life of a loyal citizen and honorable taxpayer. The faith is the sole means by which we are able to acquire the free gift of God. These four exclusives unite to us our brethren of the different evangelical confessions: *sola scriptura, solus Christus, sola gratia, sola fide!* These exclusives do not permit us to place tradition of the Church beside Scripture, the infallible ministry of the Pope beside divine revelation, the Virgin and the saints beside Christ, sole mediator, human works beside grace, nor beside

faith reason and will, both of which are incapable of knowing the plan of God or of fulfilling His Will."

Further below follows the Lutheran doctrine on sacraments:

"We have a realistic conception of the sacraments that ultimately rests upon a doctrine of the Incarnation which takes seriously the humiliation of the Son of God Who took upon Himself our human nature, and Who again today wishes to unite His Flesh and His Blood to the elements of bread and wine each time the Church celebrates in obedience and eucharistic joy the mystery of His Sacrifice and His Presence."

Here an affirmation of the Real Presence is made. A fundamental difference from Catholic doctrine lies in the reference to the Lutheran belief that Christ's Flesh and Blood are united to *the elements of bread and wine which remain as such. According to Catholic doctrine the very substance of the elements of bread and wine are changed into the substance of the Most Holy Flesh and Blood of Jesus Christ. The text continues*:

"Because the sacrament confers truly that which it signifies, our Church teaches that children should be baptized, who are thus given over to God and are permitted to participate in the grace which God offers to His children in making them members of the Church of Jesus Christ. Wherefore, Baptism is not the end and crown of the Christian life, but is its source and its commencement; it is the living sprout which will develop under the action of the Word and the Spirit, and which will bring forth the fruit of a life consecrated to God."

No mention is made of the other sacraments. The text continues with the Lutheran concept of the Church:

"Finally, we have an objective concept of the Church, defined thus by the Confession of Augsburg:

" 'It is the assembly of all the believers among whom the Gospel is preached in its purity, and the Holy Sacraments administered in conformity with the Gospel.' It is not ceremonies nor regulations nor institutions that have to do with effecting the unity of the Church, but rather agreement in the preaching of the Word and in the celebration of the Sacraments. Thus, the unity of the Church, which is the Body of Christ, is referred to its sole head, the guarantee against all impulses toward division which questions of second and third order could create within it."

This description of the Church's unity makes no reference to a hierarchy, and would evidently exclude a concept of unity requiring Pope and Bishops. The function of the Church in society is next dealt with:

"This concept of the Church excludes at the outset any temptation to make of the Church a political or social factor in the world. She allows the believers to assume public functions 'without sin' because all authorities are good institutions established by God in the world. She would not be able to admit a particular 'perfection' which would consist in living a Christian life outside the natural framework within which God assigns to each one his 'vocation.' "

Finally, the significance of the above summary exposition of Lutheran faith is brought to bear upon the relation of the Lutheran confession to other great Christian confessions. Perhaps a grave error would have been avoided by consulting Catholic sources for a just appreciation of the nature of the Roman Church. In this passage the Catholic Church is said to be founded essentially upon the Sacraments, although she professes to base her

Sacramental teachings upon the revealed Word of God, as she does in fact her own divine foundation; she moreover feels it an essential responsibility to preserve and teach the revealed Word of God in its integral purity, and in no way diminishes her reverence for Scripture when she further clarifies and completes its message by recourse to tradition. This passage, referring to the Roman Church as the "Evangelical-Catholic Church," speaks of it as being wonderful, founded essentially upon the Sacraments. The Calvinistic confession, the "Evangelical-Reformed Church" is also described as wonderful, founded essentially upon the Word of God. The "Evangelical Lutheran Church" is regarded here as still more wonderful because she is founded upon "the Sacrament and the Word of God." For this reason she is given the place of "middle-point among confessions."

Satisfaction is expressed in a Biblical renewal within the Catholic Church in recent years, and a liturgical and sacramental renewal which is now taking shape among Calvinistic communities. The Lutherans are called upon to make their particular contribution to the universal Church; to this end the members are required to know better and maintain ever more firmly their own religious heritage.

CATHOLIZING TREND IN THE DUTCH REFORMED CHURCH

The Hilversum Convent

Two recent articles in this review have brought the attention of our readers to the presence of a Catholizing movement within the Dutch Reformed Church, and to the problem that it has imposed upon that Calvinistic institution. (See UNITAS, Vol. III, No. 3, pp. 127-136, and Vol. IV, No. 1, pp. 28-33.) It has to do with the crucial problem of apostolic orders and sacraments which was formally placed before the public in the book *Reformation and Catholicity*. Accompanied by a liturgical trend, this problem is being raised energetically among Protestant groups in many other places, and since it is perhaps the key theological problem with which the Faith and Order commission of the World Council of Churches must deal, we are giving further information which has come to us through the Anglican news weekly, the *Church Times*.

The Anglicans have a special interest in this Dutch Protestant movement. Its most articulate proponents are found in a group known as the *Hilversum Convent* who look to the Anglican Church for encouragement, and with some intention of intercommunion as well. Moreover, there is a similarity—with a great difference—to the situation of the English Nonconformists with whom the Anglicans have been carrying on unionistic dealings. Both the Nonconformists and the Hilversum Convent are studying the problem of the apostolic ministry, but while the Free Churches consider it from the point of view of taking apostolic Order into their system for the mere sake of reunion with the Church of England, the Hilversum group desires the restoration of episcopacy for the sake of truth, and because they believe it to be essential in the practice of the Christian faith. Both the Anglicans and the Dutch Reformed recognize that the ministry was the crucial point in the "Catholic-Protestant" rift signaled by the World Council of Churches at Amsterdam. (See *Church Times*, Dec. 7, 1951.)

An article by Dr. R.L. Aalders, a Reformed pastor at The Hague, explains the background of the Hilversum movement. There are very few

today in the Dutch Reformed Church who insist upon the original Calvinist teaching of predestination in its stricter meaning, even though the 16th century traditions have generally been adhered to faithfully. Karl Barth has been the predominant influence in contemporaneous Dutch Reformed thought, and to such an extent that the Dutch Reformed body might be typified as Barthian-Calvinist.

It should not be supposed that the rigid Calvinistic system of the Dutch Reformed Church excludes all extraneous influences. It has the character of a national church, and hence permits the existence of minorities with a broader outlook. These minority groups keep the door open to a wider humanism and culture; they have for instance, been responsible for the absorption of German 19th century philosophies into Dutch Reformed thought, as they have for the entrance of a strong modernist tendency. Contrasting trends have arisen within this one religious body, which has as a consequence become acclimatized to internal tensions, and has been prepared for the acceptance of differing theological schools of thought.

With regard to the liturgical movement, Dr. Aalders writes "... it is a very remarkable fact that, since the beginning of the 20th century a so-called liturgical tendency has begun to appear. It cannot be said that this has been caused in any way by any outside influences. It was born entirely out of a spiritual hunger from within. It was a hunger for more than dogmatic preaching and dogmatic celebration of the sacraments. It was a hunger for the reality of meeting with God—a hunger for devotion. Nor would it be true to say that this liturgical conception has been caused by a definite theology. However remarkable it may seem, there was a liturgical movement in the Dutch Reformed Church before ever there was a theology to give a foundation for such a movement.

"As a result, there was a time when experiments were made in rather an unreasonable way. More and more, however, liturgical questions were thought out theologically, and there developed what might be called a liturgy in its fundamental structure. This liturgical theology has had a remarkable development. First, there was an attempt to develop it entirely in line with Calvin and Bucer, and after that, more in line with Luther. But the more the implications of the liturgy were understood, the closer was the approach to Catholic theology."

The writer goes on to refer to the sources of this "Catholic" sort of theology. It came through the works of Heiler and Soederblom, and later, and especially, the works of Dix, Mascall, and Thornton, along with the book called *The Apostolic Ministry* edited by the Anglican Bishop of Oxford. The extreme Barthians of this Calvinistic confession see in this Catholizing direction treason towards the Reformation; there is popular talk of Roman infiltration. The ecumenical movement gives some assurance that this direction will not be thwarted since the Dutch Reformed Church is an active and interested participant in the World Council of Churches. To ban questions involving Catholicity would mean that the official and recently-formed ecumenical ties would be undone. The liturgical movement poses difficult problems, which some solve by turning to the Roman Catholic Church. The author, however, feels that the solution for the Catholic tendency is to be found by patiently waiting and working until "a sufficient understanding of these questions has been reached—when there is room for sacraments and

Orders, which can be called sacraments and Orders in the fullest sense of the words." (See *Church Times,* March 14, 1952.)

At the present time, a draft revision of the service of the Lord's Supper along Catholic lines has been received by the General Synod, and has been conceded permissive use. Long exhortations and readings have been shortened or excised, and much of the classic pattern of the Eucharist restored. The Hilversum Convent group has adopted a book of hours compiled by Pastor J.M. Gerritsen, with the assistance of the Benedictines of Louvain. It includes four offices: Matins, in which are fused Lauds and Prime; a noon time office, combining Terce, Sext and None; Vespers and Compline. All are sung to plain-chant.

It is the Hilversum Convent group which has been most active in arousing the vital question of the apostolic ministry. This group has at its head Pastor Loos of Hilversum. Parallel movements have sprung up in other parts of Holland, notably at The Hague. The Hilversum Convent was the first to give publicity to its convictions when it drew up a declaration, composed by both ministers and laymen, on November 7, 1947. The declaration together with a set of explanatory essays, including Pastor Loos's essay on *The Apostolic Ministry,* was published under the title *Reformation and Catholicity* in March, 1950. The document met with strong opposition, but finally was given consideration by a theological commission *ad hoc* of the Synod of the Dutch Reformed Church.

The commission has now made a report to the "Council on Church Theology." It notes that the Hilversum group takes its views from both Holy Scripture and the tradition of the Christian Church, instead of from Holy Scripture alone as is the source and rule of the Reformed Church. Nevertheless, the commission advises, the group should be invited to make its contribution to consideration of the confession of faith of the Church.

The commission takes into account that the Hilversum Convent thinks it important that reunion be effected with the Anglican Church, and other confessions of similar structure, but observes that the Reformed Church desires to take part in the ecumenical movement in a universal aspect. Regarding the concrete possibilities formulated by the Hilversum Convent, the commission is of the opinion that the Reformed Church would act prematurely if it were to pronounce any final judgment upon them. It proposes rather, that a General Synod authorize a commission of theologians to discuss with members of the Hilversum Convent whether or not the present order of the Dutch Reformed Church renders impossible intercommunion with the Anglican Church.

In fine, the Hilversum Appeal is given consideration, but the group is also given grounds to fear that efforts will be made to avoid the real issue, the burning question among many serious minded Protestant thinkers, namely, the necessity of apostolic Order, and the allied problems of the nature and number of the Sacraments. (See *Church Times,* March 21, 1952.)

Salvatore Butler, S.A.

NEWS

ECUMENISM AND REUNION

W.C.C. Commission Formed by Dissident Greek Church

The Holy Synod of the dissident Church of Greece, at its meeting in March, authorised Archbishop Spiridon to appoint a permanent Commission to deal with questions relating to the World Council of Churches. The Commission will consist of the delegates to the World Conference on Faith and Order at Lund, Sweden, with the possibility that one or two more bishops may be appointed at a later date.

Archbishop of Canterbury Speaks on Ecumenism

At a half-yearly meeting of the British Council of Churches held recently at Belfast in the Presbyterian College, the Archbishop of Canterbury spoke on relationships with "ecumenical" groups. He said, "The World Council and the British Council of Churches are both parts of what is called the ecumenical movement. . . . The ecumenical movement, together with the World Council and its national Councils, has had to meet a good deal of misunderstanding." He then proceeded to deal with four questions put to him by an individual who was hesitant about joining the W.C.C. First, the Constitutions of the W.C.C. and the British Council, while specifying belief in our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour, do not make any reference to the doctrine of the Holy Trinity; they could then admit people who are unsure about our Lord's divinity. The Archbishop explained that the W.C.C. has no creed of its own, and is not a Church. As a fellowship of churches members associate so that the various groups may know one another better. For this a starting point is required, and this is the Christian faith so far as it is expressed in Christmas Day, Good Friday, Easter Day, and Pentecost. The basis 'Our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour' could sufficiently express a least common multiple of Christian cooperation. At the next Assembly, perhaps a better phrase may be found which will include explicit reference to the Trinity. From the start as described, it is hoped through mutual cooperation to search for a higher degree of agreement.

The questioner next makes the objection that his church would not feel at home in the W.C.C. since in many ways its ways and views differ. Dr. Fisher answers that there is no member Church of the W.C.C. that really feels at home there. The "Orthodox" often feel unhappy, the Anglicans are perturbed. But if all felt "at home," the unity sought for would already have been found. He continued, "Christians can follow one of two ways —talk only with those with whom they agree, or talk with all those who worship Christ as Lord, and in that common loyalty seek better agreement."

The third question: "If our Church joined the W.C.C., we should be in a minority and should always be outvoted." The Archbishop of Canterbury responds, that the W.C.C. cannot commit any Church by its votes, nor has it authority over them. The Churches as such do not vote. Officially appointed representatives vote as individuals. Moreover, there should be minorities as well as majorities in the W.C.C. since "free discussion is the life-blood of society. . . . no body of opinion is safe, unless it has the wisdom and the grace and the patience to listen to the other side."

The fourth question has to do with the political views of the unnamed

denomination, which seem distasteful to the rest of Christendom. The answer given is that the W.C.C. identifies itself with no political views. It is of advantage, however, that an unusual minority expound the Christian grounds for its convictions. Discussion might not win over the hearers, but it could well change the possible attitude of contempt or bitterness by a corrected notion of the unpopular view.

The Archbishop of Canterbury proceeded to make further clarifications. It could be supposed that the W.C.C. does nothing positive or urgent about reunion. It is not its business to frame schemes of reunion. Only Churches can negotiate schemes of reunion between themselves. It does, however, provide a meeting-place where "there may grow that mutual knowledge, trust and interest in one another without which any talk of reunion is waste of time." It is said that the result of the ecumenical movement has been to accentuate theological differences. The fact is that the various denominations have come to realize, through contacts with others, more precisely what each stands for, and what of value must not be surrendered. Growth of clarity has been accompanied by growth in charity. He pointed out the importance of the Faith and Order Department in its careful exploration of theological pre-suppositions and principles. (*Church Times*)

Nonconformist Statement on Apostolic Order

Dr. Hugh Martin, Vice-President of the British Council of Churches, speaking at a meeting of the Free Church Federal Council at Cardiff in March, deplored Christian disunity, and expressed gratitude for better relations between the "Church of England" and the "Free Churches." When dealing with the essential point of apostolic orders he said:

"Short of treason to Christian principles I am ready to go to any lengths to provide inter-communion with the Church of England, but there are some things I cannot do. One of these is to consent to an arrangement which clearly implies that our ministers are not ministers of the Church of Christ, and that our sacraments are not true sacraments.

"The Archbishop of Canterbury himself, in a very moving gesture, which does him great honour, said that he would thankfully receive at the hand of others their commission in their accustomed form. But this does not really help us. We do not for a moment question his ordination as a minister of the Church of Christ or the validity of the Anglican Holy Communion. That episcopacy is one true method of Church order we gladly acknowledge.

"We too hold firmly to the necessity for apostolic succession in the Church of Christ, but in our view it depends upon the possession of the apostolic faith, and not upon keeping the apostolic form of Church government, even if scholars could agree as to what that was. Apostolicity is a quality that belongs to the Church, not to any particular form of ministry within it."

Dr. Martin's opinions evidently spring from a concept of the Church which is incompatible with the Anglican hierarchical system, and indeed far removed from the constant Catholic teaching that the Church is a visible society governed by a divinely instituted hierarchy.

A Congregationalist Comment on Report on Church Relations

Dr. Leslie Cooke, General Secretary of the Congregational Union of England and Wales commented upon the problem of reunion with the Angli-

can confession, and particularly upon the report of *Church Relations in England* (Cf. UNITAS, III, 1, p. 43 ff.; III, 3, p. 184 ff; p. 190 ff.)

While he regretted disunity among Christians in England, he was of the opinion that developing an episcopacy within Congregationalism that would satisfy all sections of the Church of England would be a gravely difficult matter.

He said "I think he (Archbishop of Canterbury) will understand that in view of what the Report has to say about episcopacy, we cannot honestly say we welcome it, nor take the initiative in encouraging him to hope that we might find firm grounds of unity there. . . . We have friends in the Church of England, but they have to make up their minds about this matter of episcopacy. It is not just episcopacy, but episcopacy of a certain kind and in a certain succession that is the issue. The Church of South India has episcopacy, so has the Methodist Church in the United States of America, but, apparently, it is not episcopacy."

An Anglican Periodical in French

At a meeting held at Cambridge recently, a decision was made to begin publication of a mimeographed periodical in the French language, in which Anglican thought would be presented. It will continue, but in a different way, the *Oecumenica* issued from 1934 to 1940. At the meeting there were present Professors A.M. Ramsay and C.F.D. Moule, Rev. J.W. Earp, Rev. S.M. Gibbard, Canon H. Balmforth, Fr. A.G. Hebert, SSM, Rev. J.M. Perret, Rev. J.A.T. Robinson and Rev. R. Rutt, C.R. This periodical will be in no way an official publication It will be under the general supervision of the Anglican Bishops of Fulham and Gibraltar, within whose jurisdictions it will circulate. In a list of distinguished theological writers who are expected to contribute we find the names of Geoffrey Curtis, CR, and E.L. Mascall. The Editor will be Fr. A.G. Hebert, SSM, of Kelham. The French secretary will be M.H.J. Smith, La Musardiere, 15, Avenue des Ailantes, Par-Saint-Maur (Seine;) there will be other secretaries in Belgium and Switzerland.

The publication will not be an ecumenical review since this need is already met, but will give Anglican information, and give an Anglican point of view in our present troubled times to an educated Christian public. (*Church Times*)

* * * *

Around the World

ROME

Interconfessional Study Week at Biblical Institute

The 28th meeting of the *British Society for Old Testament Study* was held at the Pontifical Biblical Institute at Rome during Holy Week. Biblical scholars, Catholic and non-Catholic, from various European countries attended, under the chairmanship of Msgr. J.M.T. Barton, President of the Society.

Papers were read by Professor Kahle of Oxford, Professor Lindblom of Sweden, Fr. Coppens and Fr. Delanghe of Louvain, Dom Athanasius Miller, O.S.B., Secretary of the Pontifical Biblical Commission, Fr. Ernest Vogt, Rector of the Pontifical Biblical Institute, and others. The Holy Father

received the group of about 40 scholars on Easter Monday. In his discourse to this group of both Catholic and non-Catholic scholars he made observations that put into relief the great value of inter-confessional collaboration in the Scriptural field. He quoted Pope St. Damasus who had written to St. Jerome, "I do not believe there can be a subject more worthy of conversation between us than the Scriptures." (Ep. XXXV, Migne, P.L., vol. 22, col. 451.) He also quoted St. John Chrysostom saying ". . . the reading of Scripture procures advantages of lasting value to the soul" (Migne, P.G., vol. 52, col. 395-396,) and continued saying, "But those spiritual advantages will be genuine and solid in proportion to one's certain and accurate knowledge of what the sacred author has said. Hence, the ever-present need of devoted scholars, who in their tireless research to unfold the exact meaning of the divine word will be equipped to make wise and judicious use of that vast apparatus of bibical philology, geography, history, archeology, textual criticism and the natural sciences, so that Eternal Truth in all its splendour may shine forth to enlighten and warm the minds and hearts of men.

"It is gratifying to note from a perusal of your program, that such scholars are not lacking today in the various parts of the world, and We fondly hope that many others, who have been blessed by God with large measure of natural talent, of piety and learning, will follow you in the same praiseworthy apostolate."

Death of Dom Jerome Leussink, O.S.B.

Many will regret the decease of Dom Jerome Leussink, O.S.B., of the Priory of Chevetogne, well known and well liked among both Catholic and dissident Orientals. He died on March 29, fortified with the Sacraments.

Dom Jerome was an accomplished artist, who had mastered the art and science of Russian-Byzantine sacred art, and whose works were in great demand for Catholic Churches of Oriental rite.

He was born at Zwolle in Holland, October, 1898, entered the Benedictine Priory of Amay-Chevetogne in 1936, and made his vows in 1937. He studied at the Academy of Beaux Arts at Liege, and studied with the Russian artist Pimen Sofronof at Rome. Besides his creative works he taught missionary art at the Atheneum of Propaganda Fide.

* * * *

UNITED STATES

Advisory Committee of Dissident Oriental Churches

The heads of the various dissident Oriental Churches in America recently met at New York at the suggestion of Archbishop Michael of the Hellenic Church of North America, to discuss means of coordinating efforts for the teaching of the youth, the publication of official books, and other matters.

Archbishop Michael represented the Ecumenical Patriarchate. In addition there were present Archbishop A. Baschir (Patriarchate of Antioch,) Metropolitan Leontij (Russian Metropolitanate,) Bishop Bogdan (head of the Ukrainian Bishopric under the jurisdiction of the Ecumenical Patriarchate,) Bishop Orestes (Carpatho-Russian jurisdiction of the Ecumenical Patriarchate,) Bishop Nikon of Florida (Foreign Church Synod under the

Presidency of Metropolitan Anastasius,) Prof. G. Florovsky, Dean of the St. Vladimir Academy of New York, along with a Russian, a Serbian and a Romanian priest. (EPS)

Proposed Lutheran Merger

A proposed merger of groups belonging to the American Lutheran Conference was considered at a meeting of representatives of five Lutheran communities in New York recently. Approval was given to two committee reports on the faith and practice of the five groups, namely the American Lutheran Church, Evangelical Lutheran Church, United Evangelical Lutheran Church, Augustana Lutheran Church, and Lutheran Free Church. It was agreed that the five groups are in essential doctrinal agreement, and that no obstacle to union exists. It is desired to maintain Lutheran doctrinal confession and to favor unity in forms of liturgical worship without discouraging the modes of expression proper to particular groups. While differing forms of worship can militate against a common confessional witness, a danger is found in any tendency to equate form with faith. (Info. Serv. LWF)

Information Centers Increase Converts

The Inquiry Class and *Information Forum* methods of encouraging conversions as directed by the Rev. William J. Grace, S.J., at Milwaukee, Minn., has increased its number of converts from 60 a year to more than 200 a year. This observation was made at a reception for 45 converts, the 25th class in the last six and one half years, last March. Each class receives three months' instruction. Fr. Grace's experience would indicate that non-Catholics who are not disposed to take private instruction will often willingly attend public lectures. (NC)

* * * *

CANADA

Religious Statistics

The 1951 census of the Federal Bureau of Statistics shows that the Catholics form the largest religious group in Canada. Catholics number 6,069,496, or 43.3 percent of the total population of 14,009,429.

The United Church of Canada has 2,867,271 members, or 20.5 percent of the population, Other groups include: Church of England, 2,060,720, or almost 15 percent; Presbyterians, 781,747, or 5.6 percent; Baptists, 519,585 or 3.7 percent; Lutherans, 444,923, or 3.2 percent; Jews, 204,836 or 1.5 percent; Greek Orthodox, 172,271 or 1.2 percent; Mennonites, 125,938 or .9 percent.

The Catholic proportion of the entire population in 1951 was almost identical with that of the census of 1941, when it was 43.34 percent, but there has been an increase of more than 1,000,000 Catholics in Canada during the past 10 years.

* * * *

FRANCE

Fr. Couturier Honoured

The Melkite Catholic Patriarch of Antioch, Alexandria, Jerusalem and all the Orient, Maximus IV Saigh, has named Fr. Paul Couturier, of Lyons,

France, honorary archimandrite. Fr. Couturier has propagated the Week of Prayer for Christian Unity which is observed at the same time as the Chair of Unity Octave.

* * * *

SPAIN

Oriental Rites at the Eucharistic Congress of Barcelona

Plans made for the Eucharistic Congress of Barcelona called for a solemn pontifical Divine Liturgy in the Byzantine rite to be celebrated on one day of the Congress. Five Bishops and 20 Priests were to concelebrate.

Arrangements for the celebration of the Byzantine, Armenian, Romanian, Maronite, Copt, and Syriac rites were made in various churches of the city.

* * * *

SWEDEN

Women in Church Ministry

The right of women to enter the ministry has been raised on several occasions within the Swedish Lutheran Church. A report made in 1950 asserted that no fundamental arguments could be brought against the ordination of women to the ministry. A great diversity of views exists. One point of view is that admission of women to the ministry might endanger the position of the Swedish Lutheran Church in the ecumenical movement, and hence a solution in Sweden should await decisions within the ecumenical movement. Recently professors on New Testament exegesis in the universities of Lund and Upsala published a joint manifesto in which they declare that in their opinion the admittance of women to the ministry cannot be reconciled with the New Testament and that such a step would mean becoming unfaithful to Holy Scripture. Pastor Helmer Faelt, writing in the *Information Service* of the Lutheran World Federation, in commenting upon the varying opinions states that those favoring admittance of women to the ministry conceive of it in the light of a public office. He also remarks, "Generally speaking it seems to be true that those who are least interested in the work of the Church are the most interested in women pastors, whereas—again generally speaking—those who participate in the life of the Church take up a more hesitant or in some cases even negative attitude."

* * * *

GERMANY

Assembly of the Lutheran World Federation at Hanover

Representatives from Lutheran communities from all parts of the world will meet at Hanover, Germany in the week between July 30 and August 3, at an assembly of the Lutheran World Federation. Besides the delegates, it is hoped that laymen will attend in large numbers. It is also desired that members of other confessions be present so that these Lutheran activities will be carried on in a feeling of relationship with universal Christendom.

This Federation, promoted by Dr. S.C. Michelfelder, was created at Lund in Sweden in July, 1947, primarily for the purpose of aiding the Lutheran communities which had been gravely stricken by the disasters of the war. It is however, the outcome of efforts begun in the second half

of the last century to form organic bonds between the various regional or national Lutheran bodies.

One of the major decisions of the Assembly in Hanover will be the establishment of a department of theology. An important factor in the urge for Lutherans to meet together in Germany for this occasion was the need of obtaining a closer understanding of the theological streams within Lutheranism. (Cf. Views of Dr. Asmussen in UNITAS, Vol. IV, 1, pp. 34-36.)

Confession Among Lutherans

The *Evangelischer Pressedienst* of May 2 comments upon the problem of confession of sins. Ten established Churches belonging to the United Evangelical Lutheran Church of Germany have adopted portions of a *Constitution of Church Life* containing a section *Concerning Confession and Absolution*. The article declares that the practice of confession as here approved does not mean the reintroduction of an institution as it exists in the Roman Catholic Church. It says, "Luther never abolished confession: nevertheless, it has been to a large extent lost by the Reforming Churches." The decision would help to remedy the deficiency without obliging the individual groups. It affirms that the salvation offered by the Church becomes effective only when genuine confession is made. The Reformation principle of the "priesthood of all believers" is applied. Not only ordained clergymen may act as confessors, but so may "any Christian asked to do so by a brother in distress." Anyone hearing a confession is held to absolute secrecy even before a court of law.

* * * *

ENGLAND

Death of Dom Gregory Dix

Dom Gregory Dix, Prior of the Anglican Benedictine of Nashdom Abbey died on May 12. He is widely known for his writings as a theologian expressing the Catholic trend in Anglican thought, and as a sincere worker for unity. Among his many spirited writings are *The Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus* and *The Shape of the Liturgy*. He was born on October 4, 1901, was ordained to the Anglican ministry in 1925, entered Nashdom Abbey in 1938, but did not take solemn vows until 1940. He was greatly appreciated as a teacher, and greatly sought after as a preacher.

* * * *

ROMANIAN CHURCH

Six Romanian Refugees Enter Catholic Church

Last April, at Bari during the midnight Mass of Holy Saturday, six young "Orthodox" Romanian refugees residing at the Saint Clair Refugee Camp, became members of the Catholic Church.

Dissident Romanian Comment on Pope's Letter to Romanians

The dissident Romanian periodical *Credinta* of Paris, May, 1952, published an article on the Holy Father's Apostolic Letter to the Romanians. It speaks of the deep impression that the Pope's words have had upon Christians, and then continues, "It is nevertheless to be regretted that the

Holy Father, who is certainly better informed than anyone else, found not even one word of consolation and comfort for the 14,000,000 Orthodox who suffer the same persecution and the same humiliations as the Catholics, and who suffer for the same motive that they believe in God and defend the faith of their fathers against the Moscovite oppressors."

In this connection, we feel it should be kept in mind that the Holy Father's Letter was addressed to the Catholics of Romania who are the Pope's particular charge. We need not enter into any comparison of the manner in which the Catholics and dissidents have tried to cope with Communistic domination to feel encouraged that there are refugee "Orthodox" who would appreciate the words of a spiritual father from the Roman Pontiff.

Report on Romanian Catholic Bishops

According to a Vatican radio broadcast last March, seven Romanian Catholic Bishops have died at the hands of the Communists. The report is based on information given by the "Southeast News Agency," which ordinarily is a reliable source. Bishop Basil Aftenie, Byzantine rite Auxiliary to the Apostolic Administrator of Fagaras and Alba Julia, was reported to have died more than a year ago as a result of ill treatment. At least six have died recently for the same reasons. Only four remain alive, and these are held in the Soviet Union.

Those who have recently died in confinement are the following:

Bishop John Balan (Byzantine rite) of Lugoj; he was beaten to death in the Vacaresti prison. Bishop Valerian Trajan Frentiu of Oradea Mare (Byzantine rite) died in November, 1951, in a forced labor camp. Bishop John Suciu, Apostolic Administrator of Fagaras and Alba Julia (Byzantine rite) died in the Aiud prison. Bishop Aaron Marton of Alba Julia (Latin rite) died in prison. Bishop Augustine Pacha of Timisoara (Latin rite,) sentenced to 18 years in prison last year, died in an accident while doing forced labor on the Danube-Black Sea canal. Bishop John Scheffler of Satu Mare (Latin rite) died in the Aiud prison.

According to the same report we received the following news of the Bishops still living:

Archbishop Alexander Cisar of Bucarest (Latin rite) is doing forced labor on a railway line being built in the Kirovgrad region of Siberia (although another source reports him as being held in the vicinity of Bucarest.) Bishop Anthony Ruocovici of Jassi (Latin rite) is doing forced labor at the Dneipropetrovsk steel plants in the Soviet Union. Bishop Julius Hossu of Cluj-Cherla (Byzantine rite) is held at Nikolaev, Russia, where he is forced to shovel coal. Bishop Alexander Rusu of Maramaros (Byzantine rite) is doing forced labor at an aircraft factory in Osipenko in the Soviet Union.

* * * *

UKRAINIANS

Recently His Eminence Cardinal Tisserant visited the students at Louvain who enjoy the assistance of the Oriental Congregation. A choir of Ukrainian students met him as he entered the university, singing hymns in praise of the Holy Father, His Eminence, and the Catholic Hierarchy. Prof. Samben expressed the gratitude of the Ukrainian students. Fr. Maurizio Van de Male, Vicar General for Ukrainians in Belgium, Fr. Kyire and Mr. O. Kovalj also spoke. An official address was made by Mr. E. Fedorenko.

In Brazil the 50th anniversary of the foundation of the first Ukrainian

parish was celebrated recently. We find that at Timmins, Canada, a weekly radio programme, broadcast on Sunday afternoons, has been begun. This programme gives news of the fatherland, of the emigres, and musical renditions of Ukrainian music. The program is directed by Fr. Julian Nebesnyj and Mr. Zenobio Herasymovych.

The first number of the review *Ukraine in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart* has appeared. It is edited at Munich. Among other things it carries an article by Prof. Scherbakiwskyj on traditional modes of celebrating religious and national feasts in the Ukraine during the winter season, another by Dr. O. Hryzalj on the national poet Taras Schewchenko, along with news on the fight against communism by the Ukrainian Bishop of Lviw, Count Andrew Sheptytskyj, and various references to his pastoral letters (Oss. Rom.)

* * * *

BRAZIL

New Ordinariate for Oriental rite Catholics

A new Ordinariate for Catholics of Oriental rites residing in Brazil began to function as such on Easter day, April 13, 1952. The Ordinary is His Eminence Cardinal James de Barros Camara, Archbishop of Rio de Janiero.

The erection of the new Ordinariate and the appointment of the first Ordinary were decided by the Holy Father October 26, 1951. The effectuation of the new system was delayed so as to permit all Latin Ordinaries in Brazil to make necessary steps for the transfer of powers.

Faithful of Oriental rites who have emigrated to Brazil now depend upon the Oriental Ordinary instead of the local Latin Ordinaries. Various groups of Oriental faithful now reside in Brazil. The largest group are Ruthenian, numbering more than 100,000, with 29 priests (24 Basilians and five seculars,) five established parishes, 108 churches and chapels, 129 Sister Servants, 68 Catechists of the Sacred Heart. The second largest group are the Maronites, with centers at Rio de Janeiro, Sao Paolo, Porto Alegre, Campos, S. Joao del Rey, with several priests. There are more than 6,000 Melkites with centers at Rio de Janeiro, S. Paolo, Juiz de Flora, served by six priests. There are smaller groups of Romanians, Russians, and Armenians with a few priests of each rite.

The New Ordinary has appointed Fr. Elia Cueter as Vicar General for the Melkites, and Fr. Elia Gorayeb as Vicar General for the Maronites. He intends to appoint a Vicar General for the Ruthenians in the near future. (SICO)

* * * *

GREECE

Changes Proposed for Mount Athos

A delegation from the dissident Ecumenical Patriarch recently visited the monasteries of Mount Athos with the purpose of investigating the possibilities of reorganizing monastic life. The journal *Orthodoxia* reports the following points as necessary: Maintenance and restoration of Byzantine monuments; measures for preservation of documents in the archives; restoration of the theological seminary; installation of a printing press for reproducing ancient documents and for the publication of a periodical; renovation of hostelries for visitors so as to encourage pilgrimages; creation of a permanent exposition of works of art; modernisation of the infirmary; repair of roads leading to

monasteries; repair of irrigation system; finally, a sweeping reorganization of all monasteries. (EPS)

* * * *

NEAR EAST

Vicariate Apostolic of Aleppo

Statistics of December, 1951, show that there are 21,097 faithful of the Latin rite in the Vicariate Apostolic of Aleppo. 12,492 are in Lebanon and 8,605 in Syria. In Syria those of Oriental origin are in the grand majority (7,508 and 789 respectively;) in Lebanon the difference in number between those of Oriental and Occidental origin is small (5,614 and 5,206 respectively.)

There are 39 Latin Orders and Congregations active in the apostolate of this Vicariate: 15 male and 24 female, with 1,980 subjects. In the Latin Catholic schools of both Lebanon and Syria the dissident Oriental students are almost as numerous as the non-Christians.

The greater number of students are found in the primary schools, which number 32,044 (Lebanon 27,139; Syria, 4,905.) Non-Catholics in these schools number 6,632.

There are 20,962 students in the secondary schools (16,556, Lebanon; 4,406, Syria.) Among these there are 6,864 non-Catholics. In schools of higher education in Lebanon there are 1,360 students, of whom 814 are Catholics, 245 dissidents, and 301 non-Christians. (SICO)

* * * *

MARONITE CHURCH

Installation of New Archbishop

The Most Rev. Ignatius Ziade was installed as Maronite Archbishop of Beirut in March. He succeeds Archbishop Ignatius Mobarak who had requested the Holy Father to relieve him of his duties for reasons of ill-health.

Archbishop Ziade was born in 1906, in Harharaya-Kattine village, Kesrouan district, Lebanon. He studied at the Jesuit seminary at Beirut and was ordained in 1929. He studied Canon Law for two years in France. He then occupied the post of archpriest of St. Maron Parish, acted as Defender of the Bond for the Beirut diocese and taught Canon Law at St. Joseph University. In 1946 he was consecrated Archbishop, and administered the diocese of Aleppo in Syria.

* * * *

TURKEY

"Unitas" of Istanbul Celebrates the Council of Chalcedon

The Unitas group of Istanbul, which has its center in the Dominican Convent of that city, celebrated a solemn commemoration of the 15th centenary of the Council of Chalcedon. The celebration took place at a spot near the scene of the famous Council. The religious authorities of the city were present, including Msgr. G. Alibrandi, Chargé d'Affaires of the Holy See and Administrator of the Apostolic Vicariate, the Armenian Catholic Archbishop Kiredjan, the Byzantine Apostolic Exarch Msgr. Varuhas, the Mel-

kite and Bulgarian Patriarchal Vicars, and all Superiors of religious communities.

Speakers included Fr. Dominic Caloyeras, O.P., director of UNITAS, Mr. A. Ammiragli, President of the Association, and Fr. Vinceslas, O.M.C., professor of church history at the inter-ritual seminary of St. Louis.

St. Joseph of Leonessa Proclaimed Patron

St. Joseph of Leonessa, O.F.M.Cap., has been proclaimed patron saint of the Capuchin Mission of Turkey.

He was born at Leonessa (Aquila,) January 8, 1556, entered the convent of the Carcerelle at Assisi, January 3, 1572, and was assigned missionary to Turkey in 1587, where he remained until 1589.

He left for Constantinople in May, 1587. In that city he assisted Christians in the prisons and brought back many renegate Catholics to the faith; among whom was a bishop. In an attempt to convert even the Sultan Amurat III, the conqueror of the Persians, he was siezed and subjected to torture. He was left hanging by a hook in one hand and another in the foot for three days. After being saved miraculously, he was banished from Constantinople.

He died at Amatrice (Rieti), February 4, 1612, was beatified by Clement XII June 22, 1737, canonized by Benedict XIV June 29, 1746. His feast is celebrated February 4.

* * * *

INDIA

Discussion on Church Union

Representatives of five non-Catholic church bodies in North India, with a total membership of over 2,000,000, agreed upon a tentative plan for union at a conference held recently at Allahabad. The group comprised delegates from the Anglican Church of India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon; the Methodist Church of Southern Asia; British Methodist Churches, North India Baptists; and the United Church of Northern India and Pakistan (Presbyterian and Congregational.)

The plan for union will be sent to individual denominations for approval or revision. No agreement was reached on unification of the Anglican and Methodist episcopates. This problem will be referred to the World Conference on Faith and Order to be held at Lund in August. (EPS)

Woman President of World Council of Churches

The Star of the East, a journal dealing with the dissident Syrian Church of India and other Oriental groups, expresses joy at the election of a female member of Asiatic Christians to one of the five presidentships of the W.C.C. This first lady President is Miss Sarah Chakko, member of the "Orthodox" Syrian Church of Malabar.

19th Centennial of St. Thomas' Arrival in India

During the year 1952 celebrations of the arrival of the Apostle St. Thomas will be celebrated in India. Plans are being made for a combined celebration of all denominations and missions on a nation-wide scale. Catholics are said to be taking an active interest in the preparations.

New Journal of Theology

A new periodical, with V.E. Devadutt as editor, has been established at Serampore College, (non-Catholic) Serampore, West Bengal, with the title *The Indian Journal of Theology*. It is described as being an independent journal designed to serve Christians in India and South-East Asia as a medium for theological thought and scholarship. (EPS)

* * * *

MALABAR

Dissident Orientals

The Oriental dissident Christians of India are concentrated on the Malabar coast, although there are small colonies elsewhere. These are divided in two main branches: 1.) The *Jacobites* who seek to maintain the traditional faith of the Jacobite Church; 2.) the *Marthomites* who while maintaining an episcopal hierarchy are more or less influenced by Protestantism. The Marthomites, numbering about 200,000, separated from the Jacobites about 75 years ago.

The Jacobites numbering between 600,000 and 700,000 members are divided into two groups: One, numbering more than 300,000 members, depends, upon the Patriarch of Antioch, residing at Homs, Syria; the other, known by the name "Orthodox", is under the authority of a Catholicos residing at Kottayam, Malabar. It is the Catholicos who is backed by the stronger lay support.

This division of Jacobites occurred about four years ago when a long internal quarrel began relative to the rights to the property of the churches. The difference has been settled by the High Court of Ernakulam in recent months in favor of the party of the Patriarchate. The Court declared that the Catholicos and his followers are members of the Jacobite Church since they are members of a new church which they founded at their own instigation and in contrast to the rightful authority of the Jacobite Patriarch.

Consequently, the party of the Patriarch has taken steps to enter into possession of the common property assigned to the Jacobite community. Thus, the Catholicos and his followers will be obliged to provide churches and other religious institutions for themselves. (SICO)

* * * *

CHINA

Failure of Schismatic Movement

A so-called "reform movement" of the Catholic Church, sponsored by the Communistic regime in China, is evidently making no headway in Shanghai. None of the 200 priests of the city have been known to defect, and the faithful have disappointed the hopes of the regime.

The avowed purposes of the movement is to rid the churches of "imperialist influences." Followers are expected to denounce all foreigners as imperialists. The Holy See's supremacy is implicitly denied in the programme.

An article printed in the third edition of the new Communist paper, *Dove Courier*, gives evidence of failure in an attempt to explain it. It says, "People say that the reasons for the failure are: 1) the native clergy are

afraid to rise and assume leadership; 2) without the Bishop's approval no Catholic will follow, and 3) priests refuse to lead the movement because it is contrary to Catholic doctrine." The *Dove Courier* gives its version of the true reasons. Shanghai is a center of imperialist aggression; Shanghai has long been under imperialistic influence. The imperialists used the Legion of Mary to twist and confuse the real intention of the programme. These imperialists still have the upper hand, and use spiritual powers to intimidate and control Catholics.

Reading between the lines, we may find good reason to be proud of our Catholic brethren of Shanghai. While we may not be called upon to share their sufferings, certainly we are invited to lend the help of our prayers.

* * * *

AFRICA

Two Former Anglican Missionaries Ordained

On March 23, His Excellency Edgar Maranta, Vicar Apostolic of Dar-es-Salaam, ordained two Englishmen, John Francis Denis, and John Birch, to the priesthood. Both had been Anglican missionaries along the coast of Tanganyika. They entered the Catholic Church in 1947, studied two years at the Beda College, and then returned to Tanganyika in October, 1951, where they completed their studies at the Major Seminary of Kipalapala.

They made their submission to the Holy See at the time of the formation of the "Church of South India." They were among a number of others who at that time, and more since that time, found themselves prompted to make a final decision on the validity or invalidity of Anglican orders when they were placed in an untenable position by the attitude of the Anglican authorities on this union of Anglican communities with non-episcopal confessions in South India. (Cf. J. Gill, *Lambeth* 1948 *and the Theology of Orders*, Unitas, I, 2, pp. 11-21; J. Birch, *An Interesting Question*, Unitas, II, 2, pp. 142-146.)

The two newly ordained priests will exercise their apostolate in the vicariate of Dar-es-Salaam.

Book Reviews

Charles Boyer, S.J., *One Shepherd: The Problem of Christian Reunion.* Foreword by John LaFarge, S.J., translated by Angeline Bouchard of the School of Theology, St. Mary's College, Ind.; P.J. Kenedy & Sons, New York, 1952. pp. xvi & 142, $2.00.

In this handsomely presented little book entitled *One Shepherd,* we have a translation of a work already announced in its original French edition. It involves such pit-falls that the Catholic faithful, in all their zeal to view of the Catholic Church.

Catholics in England and America have worked hard on the problem of conversion of non-Catholics to the one true faith, and have mastered it in its many aspects. A larger problem, that of Christian reunion, has become an imperative concern in our generation; on this subject the literature is by no means so rich. It is indeed a problem of great delicacy and doctrinal complexity that has been imposed upon the Catholic conscience. It involves such pit-falls that the Catholic faithful, in all their zeal to embrace Christ's cause "That they all may be one" are likely to look upon it with some anxiety and hesitancy. The author of *One Shepherd,* whose renown as a theologian holding an eminent position at the Pontifical Gregorian University at Rome, and whose wide experience in unionistic activities bestows a certain authority upon his words, succeeds in making a lucid presentation of principles governing the Catholic approach to the non-Catholic confessions as such. In his solutions, as in the spirit of the book generally, the two obligations of defending the divine truth entrusted to the Church, and of exercising Christian charity towards our dissident brethren, are happily reconciled.

This little handbook on unity could be considered as a timely response to the demand made by the Holy Office in its *Instruction on the "Ecumenical Movement"* that Catholics be well-informed on unionistic movements, as it could be considered as a theologian's presentation of Father Paul Wattson's great vision of a united Christendom.

In broad lines it sketches the present position of Protestants, Anglicans, dissident Orientals, and of the world wide "Ecumenical Movement" in relation to Christian reunion. In some very important pages, it resolves the seeming contrast between "rapprochement" and individual conversions. While its readable style and unencumbered form make it accessible to the layman, it is none the less a book for the libraries of ecclesiastical specialists because of its pronouncements on doctrinal principles that are a challenge to the best of our theological thinkers.

We suggest to non-Catholics as well that they read it carefully to gain a just appreciation of the Catholic Church's mind with regard to Christian reunion. S.B.

M. Polsky, *The New Russian Martyrs;* (dissident;) Jordanville Monastery, N.Y. 1949 (In Russian)

We do not hesitate to say that this book is useful, interesting and instructive, even though there are some passages in it which are inadmissible for a Catholic, and even though it is coloured here and there with political allusions that are quite out of place in a religious work.

Our admiration is aroused by the fine figures of prelates, priests, and

laymen who were killed through hatred of their Christian belief. Some of them died praying for their persecutors. The public acquainted with these matters is aware that many ecclesiastics in Russia, both Catholics and dissidents, have suffered generously for Christ, but they are not so well informed on the particular persons and the details of their heroic deaths.

We suggest a good use that could be made of the material in this book. The descriptions of these noble victims of Christ's love could be used to compile small collections of portraits to be published in other languages. Such collections, complemented by the lives of our Russian Catholic martyrs, persecuted because of their fidelity to the Holy See, could serve the cause of Union admirably.

The last chapter gives an account of the Grand Duchess Elizabeth, sister of the last Czarina of Russia, who was cruelly put to death by the Bolsheviks. She was a saintly woman, of heroic charity, as we have already learned from other sources. According to her own words, she had a great devotion to our St. Elizabeth of Thuringia, and strove, with a large measure of success, to follow in her footsteps. S. Tyskiewicz, S.J.

Dr. S. Bolshakoff, *New Missionary Review;* 16 Marston Street, Oxford, England.

Dr. S. Bolshakoff, known to many through his activities and writings regarding the dissident Oriental Church, and other ecclesiastical and social matters in which he has a keen interest, has initiated a new mimeographed publication called the *New Missionary Review*, described as "incorporating the English-speaking Orthodox." It represents an endeavor to revive the pre-Revolution *Missionary Review* of Moscow.

We have received No. 1, Spring, 1952, in which we read: "*New Missionary Review* will give, first, all possible information about the Orthodox in the English-speaking world and, secondly, news about Orthodox missionary activities elsewhere." Further below we find that "The present Bulletin is an eirenic publication. It aims to present a correct and impartial picture of Orthodox missionary activities. It avoids controversy and partisanship."

This number gives a brief description of the present situation of the dissident Oriental Church with special attention to those living in the English-speaking world. A sketch of the present situation with an account of its origins is made of "English-speaking Orthodoxy" in the United States, Alaska, Japan, Canada, Australia and New Zealand, Great Britain, and China.

Dr. Bolshakoff expects to publish his bulletin four times a year. To this end he invites donations. Subscriptions guaranteeing four copies will be £1 or $3.00 a year.

Father Boyer's ... statement on ...

THE PROBLEM of CHRISTIAN REUNION

ONE Shepherd

by

CHARLES BOYER, S.J.

President of UNITAS

foreword by

JOHN LaFARGE, S.J.

THE CATHOLIC POSITION ON CHURCH UNITY clarified in a comprehensive and authoritative statement, which analyzes the significant movements towards reunion with their specific problems. The specialist in the Ecumenical Movement will find many illuminating insights of great interest in this constructive and even-tempered source book.

"This work will be of great interest to all the readers of UNITAS. It will prove to be a real 'find' for all priests who preach and promote the Chair of Unity Octave, as well as those engaged in convert work."

—Rev. Edward F. Hanahoe, S.A., S.T.L.
National Director, Chair of Unity Octave

". . . correct and up-to-date, scholarly and charitable. The author's pleas to non-Catholics are unusually powerful and moving."

—Very Rev. Archpriest Andrew Rogosh
Assistant Secretary, Catholic Near East Welfare Association

A CLARIFYING AND INSPIRATIONAL WORK THAT WILL BE TREASURED BY ALL WHO LABOR . . ."That They All May Be One"

At Your Bookstore—$2.00

P. J. KENEDY & SONS 12 Barclay Street, New York 8